STATE OF INDIANA COUNTY OF DELAWARE)) SS:)
IN THE DELAWARE	COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT
CRAIG DUNN and PHILIP WII et al., Plaintiffs,	LEY,)))
- v -) CAUSE NO.) 18D01-9305-CT-06
RJR NABISCO HOLDINGS CORPORATIONS, et al., Defendants.)

The deposition upon oral examination of NICKI C. TURNER, M.D., a witness produced and sworn before me, Thomas A. Richardson, RDR-CM, Notary Public in and for the County of Marion, State of Indiana, taken on behalf of the defendants at the offices of Medical Consultants, 2525 University Avenue, Muncie, Indiana 47303, on October 22, 1997, at 9:30 a.m. pursuant to the Indiana Rules of Trial Procedure.

VOLUME I

STEWART-RICHARDSON & ASSOCIATES
Registered Professional Reporters
Capital Center, South Tower
201 N. Illinois Street
Suite 1700
Indianapolis, IN 46204
(317) 237-3773

25

APPEARANCES ' FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: YOUNG & YOUNG 3 James H. Young, Esq. Joseph B. Young, Esq. 128 N. Delaware 5 Indianapolis, IN 46204 YOUNG & RILEY 7 William N. Riley, Esq. 277 E. 12th Indianapolis, IN 8 46202 9 CROSS MARSHALL SCHUCK DeWEESE CROSS & FEICK 10 P. Gregory Cross, Esq. 200 East Washington Street Muncie, IN 47307 11 12 Max Howard, Esq. 403 W. Eighth Street 13 Anderson, IN 14 15 FOR THE DEFENDANTS: 16 RJR NABISCO AND R.J. REYNOLDS 17 KRIEG DEVAULT ALEXANDER & CAPEHART Richard D. Wagner, Esq. 18 James G. McIntire, Esq. 19 One Indiana Square Suite 2800 20 Indianapolis, IN 46204 21 WOMBLE CARLYLE SANDRIDGE & RICE Jeffrey L. Furr, Esq. 200 West Second Street 22 Winston-Salem, NC 27101 23

```
FOR THE DEFENDANTS:
 1
          PHILIP MORRIS, BROWN & WILLIAMSON & LORILLARD
 2
          SHOOK HARDY & BACCON, LLP
 3
         William S. Ohlemeyer, Esq.
          Samuel B. Sebree, Esq.
         Gary W. Williams
 4
         One Kansas City Place
 5
         1200 Main Street
         Kansas City, MO 64105
 6
    FOR THE DEFENDANTS:
 7
         PHILIP MORRIS
 8
         BINGHAM SUMMERS WELSH & SPILMAN
         David O. Tittle, Esq.
         10 W. Market Street
 9
         Suite 2700
10
         Indianapolis, IN 46204
11
    FOR THE DEFENDANT:
12
         AMERICAN TOBACCO COMPANY
13
         DEFUR VORAN HANLEY RADCLIFF & REED
         Scott E. Shockley, Esq.
14
         201 East Jackson Street
         Suite 400
15
         Muncie, IN 47305
16
    FOR THE DEFENDANTS:
         THE TOBACCO INSTITUTE, INC. and
17
         THE COUNSEL FOR TOBACCO RESEARCH
18
         McHALE COOK & WELCH, P.C.
19
         Daniel P. Byron, Esq.
         320 N. Meridian
20
         Suite 1100
         Indianapolis, IN
                            46204
21
22
23
24
```

(Exhibit(s) 1 marked for identification).

NICKI C. TURNER, M.D.

having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth took the stand and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. OHLEMEYER:

Q Good morning, Doctor. My name is Bill
Ohlemeyer. And I represent a number of the
defendants in this case. And forgive me for
a second while I talk as I look at the
material you produced to us this morning.

We are here to take a deposition in a case involving Mildred Wiley and her husband Philip Wiley. And there is a court reporter here who is going to transcribe the questions I ask you and the answers you give. There are a number of other lawyers here who represent various parties in the case.

I doubt that everybody is going to ask you questions. I would be surprised if more than a small number of us asked you questions. And I would be surprised if

anybody has more than a small number of questions to ask you compared to the number of questions I'm going to ask you.

All of that doesn't give you a lot of information yet, but I point it out just to let you know that everybody is not here to ask you questions.

One of the first things I need to tell
you is that we need to speak to each other
verbally. You have to answer "yes" or "no."
I have to ask questions, and the court
reporter has to take them down. When I ask
you a question, hopefully, it will be a
question that can be answered verbally. And
you will have to answer it verbally. Is
that okay?

- A Yes.
- Q Have you ever been deposed before?
- 19 A Yes.

- Q How many depositions do you think you have been involved in?
- 22 A Maybe four.
 - Q And what have they generally involved?
- A One was for a disability hearing. And the other -- well, I guess I really haven't.

Maybe two or three. Two were for -- I really can't remember what they were for, the purpose. They were for people that -- I really can't remember. I've not been sued, so it wasn't like I was giving a deposition for myself. It was for other individuals.

- Q Okay. Connected with your practice as a doctor?
- A Yes.
- Q Have you ever given a deposition that had to do with Mildred Wiley before today?
- A No.

- Q Let me just tell you a couple of things I'm sure you already know. If you want to take a break at any time, let me know, and we will take one.
- 17 A Yes.
 - Q And if you don't understand a question I ask you, will you let me know?
 - A Yes.
 - Q All right. We have asked you to produce some material connected to the case. And you have produced a large amount of material. Can you describe for me generally what this is, "this" being the material I

IO

have in front of me, that you have produced for us today?

A You asked for the chart that I have. And that's what we have from both the attorneys' office for Young & Young as well as the hospital. And you asked for -- we did not see Mildred in our office. So we have no records here from being seen in the office.

You asked for literature, and that's exactly what that is. You asked for my information regarding my Barney and Calvin program, and that's what that is.

- At some point today, when it's convenient -and probably we aren't going to waste a lot
 of time -- we are going to need to make some
 kind of record or I will ask you some more
 specific questions about this. Is it in any
 particular order?
- A Not really. The records probably are on the top. And that's to do with Barney and Calvin.
- Q We may refer to this as we go along at various points in the day. But at this point, Doctor, give me a second. And I'm just going to --

A My CV is in there as well.

- Q Where did you obtain the medical literature that I find here? Does this all come from the library or do people send it to you?
- A People send to it me -- well, physicians give it to me -- and the library.
- Are there any sources of information about smoking and health that you find particularly helpful or enlightening? If somebody in your position was going to try to develop a little knowledge about smoking and health, where would you recommend they go look?
- A There's a number of articles. There are two or three articles from the New England

 Journal of Medicine that I have referred patients to or people to and, of course, the Surgeon General's reports.
- Q Do you generally find the New England

 Journal of Medicine to be an authoritative

 source of information about medical issues?
- A Yes.
 - Q Doctor, can you describe for me what your specialty is.
- A I do critical care medicine, internal care

medicine.

- Q What does that mean?
- A That means that I take care of seriously ill individuals. I take care of anything from trauma to I have taken care of a lot of different disease processes. I take care of internal medicine. I have a subspecialty in clinical nutrition as well.
- Q You say you take care of critically ill patients. Define "take care" for me.
- A I admit them. I get referred in from other hospitals. I take care of them during their hospital stay. I somewhat orchestrate what subspecialists come in. If I have a multiple trauma come in, I go from the emergency room or whenever I'm called into the case and obtaining the appropriate subspecialists. Or oftentimes the subspecialists call me into a case.
- Q Does taking care involve diagnosing or assisting in the diagnosis of their disease?
- A Yes.
- Q Does it involve treating the disease when it's appropriate and as appropriate?
- A Yes.

- Q Does it involve determining what caused the particular disease at issue?
- A Yes.

- Q Tell me the circumstances in which you are involved in determining what caused a disease that you're involved with.
- A What disease would you like me to describe?
- Q That's a good question. Leave aside acute disease. Let's talk about chronic diseases. Let me ask you this: How would you define a chronic disease?
- A Chronic disease would be any disease that would occur over any number of months to years.
- Q Is cancer a chronic disease?
- A Can or cannot be. It depends on how quickly it's diagnosed.
- Q In your practice, how often are you called upon to determine the cause of a particular cancer?
- A I'm not an oncologist. I get called -- I'm called to treat patients with lung problems, with pain that has not been diagnosed. And I go from the etiology, the symptoms, and backwards to what is causing the pain and

then from there the diagnoses. That's for the etiology. I mean, if they have been exposed -- I always ask for an exposure history. I try to take a complete history when I talk to a patient. That's all I can tell you. I don't quite understand that question, I guess.

- I assume there are times where you have Q opinions about what might have caused a particular disease in which you're involved. I take it that's correct?
- Yes, most physicians do. Α
- Q Are there times as a medical doctor here the hospital where, in connection with diagnosing and treating the disease, you are asked to determine its cause?
- Α By treating a disease, are we talking about diabetes?
- Q You're right. Let's be specific. Let's talk about cancer. In fact, you even talked about lung problems. Let's talk about lung cancer.

How often, when you are involved in the diagnosis or treatment of a lung cancer, are you called upon by another doctor or other

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- members of the staff here to determine the cause of that cancer?
- A I'm not called. I'm asked for my opinion, and I will give that opinion. But I mean, that's an oncologist's or epidemiologist's role to do that in the long scope of things.
- Q Does your specialty have a Board certification?
- A. My critical care boards, yes.
- Q So you are Board certified in critical care?
- A No, I'm Board eligible.
 - Q What is the difference between being Board certified and Board eligible?
 - A Board certified means you have passed the test. Board eligible means that you have taken -- Board certified and Board eligible means you have gone through a source of training or a length of training. And Board certified and Board eligible depends on whether you have passed the test or not.
 - Q Are you Board certified?
 - A I'm Board certifed in internal medicine and clinical nutrition.
- Q And Board eligible in --
- 25 A Critical care.

- Q Is critical care a subspecialty of internal medicine?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Have you taken the critical care board?
- A Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

- Q And what is involved then in becoming Board certified as as opposed to Board eligible?
- A Board certified means that you have taken the boards. You have also completed a time in a critical care fellowship, which I have done. I have taken the two-year critical care fellowship.
- Q What remains then or what are you lacking in order to obtain the Board certification in critical care medicine?
- A Passing the boards.
- Q How often have you taken it?
- 18 A Once.
 - Q How often can you take them?
 - A Six times. I think five or six times.
 - Q That's a bad question. Can you take them every week or every month or is it once a year?
 - A I think it's like every two years.
- Q When did you first take those boards?

- A I can't even remember. Probably back in '88, perhaps '88 or '89. It was the first time they were offered.
- Q I guess I mean, is there a reason connected with your employment why you haven't taken them again or do you have no interest in them?
- A No. The point is I'm so busy now, it would not make one difference in my practice, I do not believe. And I've thought about taking them again. When I took them, I -- when I took them, I had been ill the summer before. And I had been very, very seriously ill.

 And so I took them two months later, I believe.

I have not taken them again because I didn't think I needed it. I'm extremely busy. I have a number of patients in the house. I can't be busier than I am.

- Q I know the feeling. Do you belong to any professional associations?
- A Yes.
 - Q Which ones?
- A American College of Nutrition; American
 College of Physicians; American Thoracic

Society; American Trauma Society; American,
I guess, College of Critical Care Medicine.
I can't think of all of them.

- Q Do you teach any classes to medical students?
- A Yes.

- Q Which classes do you now teach and tell me what classes you have taught in the past.
- A I have taught pulmonary medicine, basics of pulmonary medicine, to I think they were sophomore medical students. And I've taught regarding clinical nutrition.
- Q In your pulmonary medicine classes, what textbooks do you use?
- A I can't tell you that.
- Q Do you have textbooks you refer to or books you refer to in that area?
- A Yes, but I can't tell you the authors. They are at the library, you know.
- Q I mean, if I came to you and said I want to read up on pulmonary medicine, what would you tell me to go read?
- A There's a number of clinical -- there's a number of books on pulmonary medicine. I wouldn't be able to tell you the author

23

24

25

Α

- right now. I can't remember. 1 2 I guess is it fair to say one's as good as Q the other? 3 There are some that are better than others, 4 Α 5 the way they are written, the way they are 6 organized. 7 Q Are you involved in any civic associations 8 or do you have any appointments to any civic 9 community boards, boards of directors? 10 Α Not right now, no. 11 Have you been in the past? Q 12 Α Yes. 13 Q Which ones? 14 Α I was named to Muncie's Environmental Board, 15 and then there was also a tobacco task force 16 that I was named to. 17 Q What was the purpose of the tobacco task 18 force? 19 Α To try to get public buildings and 20 restaurants smoke free. 21 Q And when was that?
 - Q One way to accomplish that would obviously be to stop the sale of tobacco products.

I think it was three or four years ago.

can't remember.

And people have different opinions about that. What do you think about whether or if cigarettes should be sold in this country?

THE WITNESS: What does that have to do with this situation?

MR. OHLEMEYER: Well, there are a lot of questions, Doctor, that the rules allow us to ask that aren't specifically related to Mrs. Wiley. And whether or if any of that gets used beyond today, somebody else decides somewhere else. But for the time being, we get to ask a number of questions that aren't specifically related to Mrs. Wiley.

- A So the question is: Do I think?
- Q Do you think they ought to ban cigarettes?
- A Yes.

- Q Is that a view that you have come to recently or have held in the past?
- A I have held in the past.
- Q When did you form that opinion?
- A Probably the 1970s.
 - Q And how did you form it? What was it that caused you to form that opinion?
 - · A Well, most of it was because of my patients

1.6

that I had been taking care of during my -I was a nurse before I was a physician. And
I took care of patients then. And as I
became a physician because of the patients I
have taken care of.

- Q And what was it about your relationship with those patients that led you to come to that conclusion?
- A I've taken care of a number of patients that have died and have been critically ill, have lost legs, have had major surgeries, that have had strokes, a number of reasons why I felt that this product should not be sold.

 I think that these patients are victims, and they are addicted. And then they become very ill.
- You have produced for us today a big stack of what a lot of us would refer to or describe as medical literature. Is that right?
- A Yes.
 - And "big stack" is my word. I'm not holding you to that. I'm not using that to try to describe it. But what I want to know is explain for me what medical literature is.

- A Medical literature is experts that have -are either researchers or clinicians would
 do a study or review literature, previous
 literature, present literature, and come up
 to some summaries and conclusions about a
 subject.
 - Q So these people have background or experience in a specific field?
 - A Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

- Q And they create either an experiment or a study?
 - A Or they review the literature.
 - Q Or they review the work of others?
- 14 A Yes.
- Q And then they draw conclusions from that work?
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 Q And they write it up in a report?
- 19 A Yes.
- Q Do they typically have to submit it to
 another group of people to decide whether or
 if their conclusions should be published, I
 guess?
- 24 A Yes.
- Q And what then is the point of publishing

- those opinions or those conclusions?
- A Well, it would hopefully to be informing other individuals, specifically clinicians that read that literature.
- Q Inform them of advances, developments, ideas connected to those fields?
- A Yes.

- Q Is that process a dynamic one? By that, I mean, does the fact that one group of people does a study and publishes results, does that encourage or create interest in other people doing the same thing?
- A It's hard to say. Some individuals do studies for the sake of money. Others do studies for the sake of the work that they are doing. It depends on what forces are around them.
- Q When you say "for the sake of money," what do you mean by that?
- A There are some clinicians, research people, that apply for government funds and do funds -- I mean, they are essentially professional researchers.
- Q Because they can obtain money to sponsor the research?

- A In certain fields, yes.
 - Q Have you ever done any original research in the areas of smoking and health?
 - A No.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

20

- Q Have you ever published any of these types of papers in the areas of smoking and health?
- A No.
 - Q What about with regard to the etiology of lung cancer? Have you ever done any original research with respect to the etiology of lung cancer?
 - A No.
 - Q Have you published any papers with respect to the relationship between cigarette smoking and lung cancer?
- 17 A No.
 - Q Do you subscribe to any medical journals?
- 19 A Yes.
 - Q Which ones do you subscribe to?
- A Annals, Annals of Internal Medicine;

 Clinics, Clinics of Chest Medicine; American

 Journal of Medicine. There's a number of

 them.
 - Q Are there others you read and review on a

```
regular basis?
 1
 2
       Α
           Yes.
 3
           Which ones are those?
           I review Trauma, Clinics, Critical Care,
       Α
           American Journal of Medicine, New England.
 5
           Are you familiar with Devita's book, "Cancer
 6
       Q
 7
           Principles and Practice of Oncology"?
 8
       Α
           No.
 9
           What about Dal and Hammer, "Pulmonary
       Q
           Pathology"?
10
           Dal and Hammer, if that's one of the books I
11
       A
           have. I have several books at home that I
12
           read, but I don't look at the authors.
13
           It's a big blue book.
14
       Q
15
       Α
           Yes.
16
       O
           That's the one?
17
       Α
           Yes.
18
           So you have that book?
       Q
           Yes, if that's the one I have. It's a
19
       Α
20
           two-volume book.
21
       Q
           What about Thurlbeck and Churg, "Pathology
22
           of the Lung"?
                 I have an old edition of that.
23
       Α
24
           edition is in the library.
                                         I review it as I
```

need to.

- Q Alsner, et al., "Comprehensive Textbook of Thoracic Oncology"?
- A No. I'm not an oncologist. I'm a critical care.
- Q And that's to say there's a difference in what you are required to do with respect to the patient and what the oncologist is required to do?
- A To a certain extent, yes.
- Q We have talked a little bit -- I don't want to spend a whole lot of time on this, just a couple more questions -- about cigarettes and cigarette smokers. Am I correct that you have expressed your opinion that cigarette smokers are -- and I don't want to put words in your mouth. Are they all addicted to cigarette smoking or just some number of them addicted to cigarette smoking?
- A Since I'm not a cigarette smoker, it's hard for me. I think many of them are addicted to cigarette smoke. It depends on how long they have been smoking. It depends on their age.
- Q Would a diagnosis of addiction be something

that you would be qualified or comfortable in making in a cigarette smoker?

A Yes.

- Q On what basis?
- A How long they have been smoking, have they tried to quit, how many times they have tried to quit, what happens when they quit, what type of side effects they have when they try to quit.
- Q Do critical care physicians typically diagnose and treat patients for addictions?
- A Well, our group here, we have six physicians -- five physicians that are active now.

We are somewhat different than most critical care physicians. If you go to a large center that primarily -- that intensivists normally practice at, they do not do as much internal medicine as we do here.

We have five physicians that do a combination of -- we kind of transcend subspecialties because of our geographical areas. We get referrals from a number of counties. So we're asked to do things that

- intensivists are often not normally asked to do.
- Q You're not the type of doctor that people go to see for diseases of the mind or other psychiatric or psychological disorders, right?
- A Usually not. I have had patients that I have been referred in because the family physician didn't know what to do with them.

 And they were -- I refer them to other individuals, including psychiatry.
- Q Certainly you don't hold yourself out as a psychiatrist or psychologist?
- A No.

- Q You don't have the type of insurance that would allow you to diagnose and treat those types of diseases, do you?
- A No.
 - Q And if you had a question about psychiatry or psychology in one of your patients, you typically would consult in or refer in someone else at the hospital, wouldn't you?
 - A For psychiatric illness, yes.
 - Q Do you think addiction is a psychiatric illness?

A I do not believe so.

- Q How would you describe it? What kind of illness is it?
- A Well, it's kind of semantics. Addiction -I mean, people are addicted to alcohol as
 well. And you don't always have to have a
 psychiatrist see an alcoholic to treat
 alcoholism. So it's similar, you know, to
 the same area.

A psychiatrist or a psychologist would see an individual with psychoses or schizophrenia, severe manic-depressive disorders, severe depression. But addiction, I mean, people are addicted to a number of things.

- Q So if I understand what you're saying, for pharmacological or certain types of addictions, you would be more comfortable having a psychiatrist or a psychologist involved. For behavioral or other types of addictions, you're --
- A What kind of addictions are you talking about to a psychiatrist? I mean, what kind of addictions would be referred to a psychiatrist?

Q Heroin?

- A Not always.
 - Q Let me ask you this: You mentioned the word "semantics." Is there an issue of semantics when it comes to the idea of "addiction"?
 - A Addiction is addiction. Addiction is a physiological effect that occurs when individuals go without a substance they have been using, whether it be heroin or marijuana, or primarily heroin or cocaine or whatever.
 - Q Is that how you would define addiction? Are there other definitions?
 - A Of physiological, there are both physiological as well as I guess you could term psychological addiction.
 - Q Behavioral?
 - A Behavioral addiction. But primarily it's psychological, from both alcohol as well as nicotine.
 - Q Like I said, I don't want to spend a lot of time on this. But does the fact that 'someone is addicted to cigarette smoking, as you have defined it, prevent them from quitting smoking?

A Yes.

Q Let me ask the question again to make sure we both understand.

Does the fact that someone is addicted to cigarette smoking, as you have defined it, prevent them from quitting? Let me rephrase the question. Does it make it impossible for them to quit?

- A It makes it very difficult. And to some individuals, it can make it impossible.
- Q I'm sorry to interrupt. Finish your answer, if you want. I was going to ask you how you figure out when it's impossible and when it's difficult.
- A It depends on the success. It depends on what we have to do to try to help them off the drug. Am I answering your question?
- Yes, that's fine. Anything else? I'm sorry, Doctor. And I apologize for this. There are times where I may be looking at something while you're still answering your question. I don't mean it as disrespect or disinterest. I'm trying to kind of look at some things to save some time as we move along. You can tell we have a lot of

material in front of us.

I read a newspaper article about you where they described you as an anti-smoking crusader.

- A I'm not a crusader. If you have ever had anybody from the press talk about you, they put words in your mouth.
- Q I have.
- A And they change things. And they try to sell newspapers.
- Q Amen. So you wouldn't consider yourself an anti-smoking crusader?
- A No.

- Q Would you consider yourself an anti-smoking activist?
- A Not really.
 - Q I saw a couple of pieces of information in the material you produced today that dealt with tobacco control and the Tobacco

 Products Liability Litigation Project. Does that ring any bells for you?
 - A Tobacco Litigation Project, what is that?
 - Q I will just ask you this way: Do you think that lawsuits against tobacco companies should be used as a means of tobacco

control?

- A I would hope that instead of that, there
 would be legislation or some type of control
 placed so that we don't have the product.

 I'm never in favor of litigation because,
 first of all, there are lawyers involved.

 And I think it -- I mean, any time we can
 avoid litigation, I think that's the best
 way of doing it.
- Q The reason I ask, I'm holding a piece of information entitled, "Tobacco on Trial:

 Reporting on Litigation and Other Tobacco
 Control Strategies" that you produced.
- A I didn't produce that.
- Q I'm sorry, "produce" is a term of art.

 You're right. It was brought to the

 deposition today by you.
- A Yes.
 - Q You obviously received this from somewhere else. Do you subscribe to this?
 - A Currently, no; but I did last year.
- Q Have you in the past?
- 23 A Yes.
 - Q For what purpose did you subscribe to it?
- 25 A Primarily for information, and I try to be

educated on the subject.

- Q Was the fact that you were involved in this case or in connection with Mr. Wiley's prior claim one of the reasons you subscribed to this?
- A Not really. This is a relatively new product that's out. And it allows us to be more informed about the situation across the country.
- Q The lawsuit situation?
- A Just information about tobacco.
- Q Derived from lawsuits though, right?
- A Well, just any information about tobacco, whether it be from that or -- I have a number of other articles there about tobacco that have nothing to do with litigation.
- You obviously formed some opinions -- well, the Surgeon General of the United States obviously formed some opinions in the 1960s about smoking and health. You formed some in the 1970s. Why is it do you think cigarettes are still sold in this country?

MR. JAS. YOUNG: I will object to that. That's completely irrelevant to the issues of the case. It has nothing to do

with Mildred Wiley or any of the issues we are here to talk about.

MR. OHLEMEYER: From time to time,
Doctor, the lawyers can make objections that
the judge decides later. So you can go
ahead and answer the question.

THE WITNESS: Can I answer it?

MR. JAS. YOUNG: Sure.

THE WITNESS: What was your question?

Q I guess you would agree with me in the 1960s, the Surgeon General of the United States formed some opinions about smoking and health. Public health organizations have formed opinions about smoking and health. You formed an opinion in the 1970s about smoking and health.

Why is it do you think cigarettes are still sold in this country?

MR. JAS. YOUNG: Show the same objection.

THE WITNESS: Why do you think they are sold?

Q My question is: Why do you think people haven't come to the same conclusion that you

have that they shouldn't be sold?

- A A lot of it has to do with education and getting the public to understand what happens to them.
- Q And do you fault anybody or do you hold anybody responsible for not accomplishing that education?
- A Yes.

- Q Who?
- A The tobacco industry.
- Q What about the government?
- A What about the government?
 - Q Well, don't they have a role to play in educating people and providing them with information?
 - A Part of the problem is that the money is not spent in that area. The money is spent in other areas. In the 1970s and 1980s, other things were happening in this country. So the government, they don't do a lot of educating on a lot of things. But it's not the government's role.

I mean, if a drug is sold, if Procardia is sold, XL, or Adalat is sold, it's the person that -- it's the company that is

producing that that is responsible for the education.

Q By law?

- A Well, it's by law or ethics.
- Q Let's start with by law. The law requires drug companies, pharmaceutical companies, to provide certain information to consumers or to physicians in connection with the sale of their product, right?
- A Yes, I guess. I don't know. I'm not a pharmacist, so I don't know.
- Q Do you know whether there's a law that requires tobacco manufacturers to provide certain information to consumers in connection with the sale of their products?
- A I don't know.
- Q Bearing in mind everything you have said about the press, in this same article, you are quoted as saying that exposing youngsters to secondhand smoke is a form of child abuse. Is that a statement you agree with?

MR. CROSS: For the record, could you identify the date and source?

MR. OHLEMEYER: I'm sorry. July

15th, 1994, Muncie Press.

Q Do you think children should be removed from homes in which parents or other family members smoke?

MR. JAS. YOUNG: I will object again. We're getting far afield about what we are here to deal with. We are here to deal with Mildred Wiley, and we are here to deal with secondhand smoke exposure in the workplace. And the newspaper articles about Dr. Turner don't have anything to do with this case. I think we should get to the point.

Q Let me rephrase the question, Doctor. Do you think that children should be removed from homes in which a parent or other family member smoke?

THE WITNESS: That's not rephrasing it. That's the same question. What does it have to do with Mildred Wiley? I don't understand what the connotation is.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Like I told you, there are a lot of rules. Just like you have a lot of rules, and I have a lot of rules. I could explain it all to you, but I

don't think you want to spend time listening to the Rules of Civil Procedure.

A Well, the thing is, I think a lot of parents do things around their children that they don't understand is wrong or is inappropriate for their children.

There are a lot that parents do. They fight. They do a lot of things that have an impact on children. But you can't outlaw everything in the home. What we have to do is educate.

Q So I take it the answer to my question is you don't think the Division of Family Services should remove children from homes where parents or other family members smoke?

MR. JAS. YOUNG: I will object to you testifying and restating her testimony. I will object to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: I guess I don't understand what -- I know what you're asking me. But I don't understand what the impact of this case is regarding that question.

Q Well, I guess, maybe I left a part out. In most states, if there is child abuse occurring in the home, it provides a legal

ground for the state to remove children from the home, put them in foster care or Division of Family Services.

My question to you is very simply:

Assuming that you believe that exposing children to other people's smoke is a form of child abuse, do you think those children should be removed from homes where that occurs?

MR. JAS. YOUNG: I will object again. You are asking this witness to make global decisions and assertions of what goes on in people's homes, asking for legal conclusions. It's completely irrelevant to the case. It has nothing to do with it.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Do you recall the question?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

- Q And the answer?
- A The answer is I think that with additional education of our public officials as well as parents, I think those problems would be taken care of by parents not smoking around their children. That's the answer. It's additional education from the harmful

effects of secondhand smoke.

So the answer is not removing the children from the home?

MR. JAS. YOUNG: I will object to you testifying.

A I don't know. You're putting words in my mouth.

MR. JAS. YOUNG: You should ask questions. You shouldn't lead the witness. And you should not be rephrasing or trying to restate what she has testified to. I think that's objectionable.

- Q I have also read in the newspaper -- and I am as sceptical and critical of what I read in the newspaper as you have suggested you are -- that you are an environmental activist. Is that a fair description?
- A Yes.
- It says that you have purchased and built a nature preserve with a 2-acre pond, a forest, thousands of trees, and a house. Is that true?
- A I have bought 60 acres of farmland, planted 20,000 trees, and am building a house.

MR. JAS. YOUNG: Excuse me. What

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

article are you referring to?

MR. OHLEMEYER: It's a February 21, 1996, article in the Indianapolis News.

What did you have to do to have it designated as a wildlife habitat?

MR. JAS. YOUNG: Objection again.

Relevance.

- A Jeepers. That article was put in at the request of the Department of Natural Resources because they were promoting wetlands and wildlife habitat.
- Q I guess my question is a little simplier than that. Did you do that because of the tax advantages?
- A Oh, right, yeah. No, I don't think so.
- Q There was some suggestion that there are people that do that.
- A Well, I don't do it. The difference between farmland and putting crops in farmland and wildlife is not that much.
- Q Have you ever testified, in the three or four or five times you told us about that you testified, about cigarette smoke and its relationship to disease?
- A I do not recall that I have.

- Q Did you tell me you have never been involved in a lawsuit as a party in connection with your professional activities?
 - A Not that I'm aware of.

- Q Have you ever been involved in a lawsuit as a party in any type of situation, either sued somebody or been sued?
- A I don't think so. I can't recall.
- Q If you had been sued, you would recall it.

 Tell me how you prepared for the deposition today.
- A Well, I reviewed articles that I had reviewed previously, I have reviewed books that I had reviewed previously, and I reviewed the charts.
- Q Is there any way for you to describe for me with any particularity which articles or which books you reviewed?
- A They are right in front of you.
- Q It's this whole --
- A Well, I reviewed most of those. I reviewed them before.
- Q Do you recall how long it took you to do that?
 - MR. JAS. YOUNG: To do what?

```
To review that
                    MR. OHLEMEYER:
 1
 2
           material --
                    MR. JAS. YOUNG: At which time?
 3
                                     -- in connection
                    MR. OHLEMEYER:
           with this deposition.
 5
                                      In what time
                    MR. JAS. YOUNG:
 6
           period?
 7
                    MR. OHLEMEYER: Any time period.
 8
           My question, Doctor, is from the time you
 9
       Q
           learned you were going to be deposed to
10
           today, how much time did you spend reviewing
11
           this material in preparation for the
12
           deposition?
13
           Deposed from what I saw, the letter that was
14
                             Is that your question?
           sent last week?
15
           Let's back up. When did you first learn to be be a
16
           that you would have to sit down and testify
17
           in a deposition in connection with this
18
           case?
19
           Probably a number of months.
                                          But we weren
20
       Α
           sure when.
21
           From the time that happened, whenever it
22
           was, until today, how much time have you
23
           spent reviewing charts, books, or articles
24
           in connection with this case, this
25
```

deposition, or the issues that you thought would arise today?

A Several hours. I have been extremely busy in my clinical practice. That's one of the reasons why this deposition wasn't last week.

Two of my people are out. Two of my partners are out. And I'm extremely busy. And when you get done finishing rounds late at night, you don't have much time.

- Q So is it fair to say that you haven't spent more than several hours in reviewing this material?
- A You have to understand that I have read the articles before. And I have reviewed what I felt I needed to review as adequately as I can to be prepared.
- Q What context did you read the articles before?
- A For my own information and also for educational purposes.
- Q Off the top of your head, are there specific books or specific articles that you can kind of point to or identify as seminal or important on the relationship between

smoking and health or exposure to other people's smoke and health in this material that you have provided to us?

- A Well, there's the Surgeon General's report.
- Q 1986?

A Yes. And there's the tobacco papers. And there's a number of articles down there.

There is a New England Journal of Medicine article. I believe it's '89, whenever it was. It's been a long time since I looked at the date.

I mean, there's a number of articles.

I can't tell you authors.

- Are there particular authors or particular authors or particular articles that if somebody said to you, you know, what's the most important or the most seminal or the most informative or the most interesting article about cigarette smoke and its relationship to disease or environmental smoke and its relationship to disease?
- A What I do is I have the articles. They copy those articles. I give them those or whatever articles at the library at the hospital. And they copy what they want.

```
Somewhere within this group of articles that
       Q
           you have provided to us, you would say those
 2
 3
           are the ones?
       Α
           Yes.
                     MR. JAS. YOUNG: Counselor, could
 5
           we take a short break?
 6
                                           Before we do,
 7
                    MR. OHLEMEYER:
                                     Yes.
           can I ask what is your position or what's
 8
           the situation with respect to compensation?
 9
           Am I obligated to compensate the doctor for
10
           her time in preparing the deposition and
11
           sitting for the deposition?
12
                    MR. JAS. YOUNG: We haven't really
13
           decided. Sitting for it definitely.
14
                                     What about
                    MR. OHLEMEYER:
15
           preparation?
16
                    MR. RILEY: Let us think in the
17
18
           hallway on that.
                 (A recess was taken from 10:23 a.m. to
19
           10:33 a.m.)
20
21
    BY MR. OHLEMEYER:
           Doctor, if you don't understand a question I
22
       Q
23
           ask you, will you let me know?
24
       Α
           Yes.
25
           I take it you are not a smoker?
```

Α No. 1 2 Q Have you ever been a smoker? 3 Α No. 4 Q Have you ever tried a cigarette? 5 Α No. Do you let friends or family members smoke 6 Q in your presence? 7 Α I don't have any friends or family 8 members that smoke. 9 10 Q Let me ask you this: Do you ask people not 11 to smoke in your presence? Yes. 12 Α Can you recall when you first started doing 13 14 that? 15 MR. JAS. YOUNG: I will object. That doesn't have anything to do with this 16 It doesn't have anything to do with 17 case. 18 her qualifications. It doesn't have 19 anything to do with Mildred Wiley. Let's 20 get to the meat of the matter. Doctor, when was the first time you can 21 Q · 22 remember asking someone not to smoke in your 23 presence? 24 MR. JAS. YOUNG: I object. objection.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	A	I can't reca
2	Q	Would it hav
3		Can you pin
4		MR.
5		It's irrelev
6		the case.
7		THE
8		answer?
9		MR.
10	A	I can't reme
11	Q	That's fine.

11.

e been in the '80s or the '70s? it on a decade?

> JAS. YOUNG: I will object. It has nothing to do with ant.

> > WITNESS: Am I supposed to

JAS. YOUNG: Yes.

- mber.
- If you don't remember, you don't remember.

When did you form an opinion that exposure to environmental tobacco smoke presented a risk to the health of the nonsmoker?

- Probably in the 1980s.
- Q And what was it that caused you to come that conclusion?
- Α Articles that were coming out from medical literature.
- Q Would you agree with me that passive smoking -- and by that, I mean, the inhalation of smoke of tobacco products used by others -- was first associated with human

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

48 cancer in 1981 when two publications 1 reported higher rates of lung cancer among 2 nonsmoking women married to smokers? 3 That was by Hiawatha or whatever his name Α 5 is. 6 Q Hirayama? 7 Α Yes.

> MR. JAS. YOUNG: If you are referring to a certain document, it might be fair to the witness to show her what you are talking about.

> I'm just asking MR. MR. OHLEMEYER: the question.

MR. JAS. YOUNG: My point is it would be fair to let her know what the documents you are referring to are and show them to her.

- Doctor, if you don't understand a question 0 or you don't think the question is fair to you, will you let me know?
- Α Yes.
- Q My question to you is: Do you agree or disagree that passive smoking -- and by that, I'm defining it as the inhalation of smoke from tobacco products used by

- others -- was first associated with human cancer in 1981?
- A I can't tell you that because I think there was some other additional studies that were being done in the 1970s, I believe, by other individuals. Now, that was one of the articles that came out in 1981.
- Q You talked about your opinions and forming your opinions based on articles that were coming out. Are you familiar with the Hirayama and Trichopoulos studies?
- A Yes.

- Q Can you tell me about any studies that came out before about Hirayama or Trichopoulos?
- A The original question asked whether I had stopped exposure to secondhand smoke because of harm. And another question comes up about cancer. Those are kind of two questions.
- Q Let me --
- A Are you talking about cancer or are you talking about just harm?
- Q My question to you is: When did you first associate exposure to other people's tobacco smoke with cancer?

1	A	When did I first associate it? Probably in
2		the '80s.
3	Q	And was that as a result of things you had
4		read in the medical literature?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	And can you recall reading anything prior to
7		the '80s in the medical literature that
8		associated exposure to other people's
9		tobacco smoke with cancer?
10	A	I can't recall now, but that doesn't mean I
11		didn't do it.
12	Q	Do you claim any background or any
13		experience in the design or manufacture of
14		cigarettes?
15	A	No.
16	Q	Do you claim any background or any
17		experience in marketing?
18	A	Of cigarettes or tobacco products?
19	Q	Of cigarettes, tobacco products, or any
20		other products.
21	A	Of cigarettes or tobacco products, no.
22	Q	Do you do surgery? Are you a surgeon?
23	A	I do procedures. I do not do surgery.
24	Q	By "procedures," you mean things like
25		bronchoscopies?

- A Swans, arterial lines, central lines, those type of procedures.
 - Q You don't consider yourself a pathologist?
 - A No.

3

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q You don't consider yourself an oncologist you told me, right?
- A No.
- Q Do you consider yourself an epidemiologist?
- A No.
- 10 Q Or a toxicologist?
- 11 A No.
 - Q Can you describe for me, Dr. Turner, when and how you first became involved with Mildred Wiley?
 - A I was asked to see the patient by Scott Walker. He's an orthopedic surgeon.
- 17 Q Let me --
 - A Can I have the chart in front of me?
 - Q Sure. What can we give you?
 - A The chart.
 - Q Tell me what you mean by a chart.
 - A The chart is the hospital chart. It has to be with HNT. It has to do with progress notes, what happens during that patient's stay in the hospital.

Q Let me tell you it's not a memory test either. I'm just trying to fix some time periods.

Is it fair to say, am I correct that before you became involved in the care of Mrs. Wiley, you didn't have a preexisting relationship with her or her husband?

- A No.
- Q You didn't know them socially?
- 10 A No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

. 23

24

25

Q

- Q Or professionally?
- 12 A No.
 - Q Your first contact with them was when she was in Ball Memorial Hospital?
 - A Yes.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Let me have tab three. Let me mark this as Exhibit 2.

(Exhibit(s) 2 marked for identification).

MR. OHLEMEYER: For the record, we have marked Exhibit 1, the Notice. And let me hand you, counsel, a copy of what I'm going to mark as Exhibit 2. This is a -- Doctor, why don't you tell me what this is.

I don't see a title on it. I don't want to

- "misdescribe" it. It looks like a consultation report dated May 31, 1991, signed by you.
 - A Dated the 30th of May. Yes, I dictated it the 30th of May.
 - Q What is the significance of that 5-31-91?
 - A That's when it was dictated, I mean when it was transcribed.
 - Q So you signed it on the 31st?
 - A I don't know when I signed it. I'm telling you I dictated it on the 30th.
 - Q Very good. And is this your initial description of the patient named Mildred Wiley that's described here?
- 15 A Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q Would this have been at or near the time you first became involved in Mrs. Wiley's treatment?
- A Yes.
 - Q Where did the factual information in this report come from?
 - A It came from the patient.
- Q Did you actually ask her these kinds of questions, the kinds of questions that elicited this information?

- A Yes, her husband may have been present as well. This lady was in a lot of pain.
- You see in the second sentence there where it says, "The patient has somewhat of a complicated past medical history"?
- A Yes.

б

II

- Q Is that a conclusion that you reached or a statement that was obtained from Mr. or Mrs. Wiley?
- A That's my statement.
 - Q What is the basis of your statement that she had a complicated past medical history?
 - A Because she had been under care from -- as you can see on the dictation, she had been seen by several other physicians.
 - Q And for what reason had she been seeing those other physicians?
 - As you can see, her illness began in October of 1990. So she had been treated -- in January of '91, she was evaluated for possible sinusitis. She was seen by Dr. Toney at the Sports Clinic. She had been seen by Mr. Patel over in Marion. She was seen by Dr. Coombs. And she was seen by Walker.

	l	
1	Q	Who is Dr. Coombs?
2	A	He is an orthopedic surgeon.
3	Q	Who is Dr. Walker?
4	A	He is an orthopedic surgeon.
5	Q	Do you know whether she ever saw an ear,
6		nose, and throat specialist during this time
7		period between October of '90 and May of
8		191?
9	Α.	I have no recall of that. I mean, I do not
10		know.
11	Q	On the second page, the end of that first
12		paragraph, it says the only allergy is
13		sulfa. Is that information you obtained
14		from the patient?
15		MR. JAS. YOUNG: I'm sorry. Where
16		are you?
17		MR. OHLEMEYER: We're on page 2,
18		about four lines up, the first paragraph
19		there.
20	A	I would have gotten that from the patient or
21		her husband or some family member.
22	Q	It says, "The patient does not drink; nor
23		does she smoke." Do you typically ask
24		patients whether they drink or smoke?
25	A	Yes.

- Q Do you have a set of questions that you ask patients the first time you see them?
- A Yes.

- Q And is that called taking a history from the patient?
- A Yes.
- Q And is that information considered -- do you consider that information subjective or objective?
- A Objective.
- Q What do you mean by that?
- A That means that it has to do with how we come up with conclusions about how we -- what tests we order, what our suspicions are, what's going on with that patient.
- Q Is it fair to say though, Doctor, a lot of that information is not information that you can observe in the patient?

MR. JAS. YOUNG: What information are you referring to?

- Q Let me rephrase the question. When you take this history, do you ask the patient about things or behaviors or practices that the patient has engaged in in the past?
- A Yes.

- Q And those are things, of course, to which you were not an eyewitness, right?
 - A Sometimes you can tell a patient drinks or smokes by sitting in front of them.
 - Q Could you tell whether Mildred Wiley drank or smoked by looking at her?
 - A No.

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

- Q For example, do you treat people who have been exposed to asbestos?
- 10 A Occasionally I have.
 - Q Occupationally exposed to asbestos?
- 12 A Yes.
 - Q Can you be tell by looking at somebody if they've been occupationally exposed to asbestos?
- 16 A No.
 - Q To the extent you ask them about their occupational history, they have to provide you with some information that's not readily observable; isn't that right?
 - A Yes.
- 22 Q The same thing in a situation like this. I
 23 mean, some of what you are asking Mrs. Wiley
 24 is not something that you can immediately or
 25 objectively discern; isn't that right?

- No, we had to take their word for it. Α
- And is it fair to say that histories can Q be -- the accuracy of a history can be affected by somebody's memory or recollection?
- But 99.9 percent of the time when Α someone is giving you a history, they are searching for help. And they may not be honest with other people, but they are certainly -- I mean, 99.9 percent of the time they are honest with you.
- Q They are typically sick or in some kind of distress?
- They are typically sick and they want help. Α
- They are talking with a doctor who is there Q to help them?
- Α Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- So they are doing everything they can to Q provide you with as much information and with as much accurate information as they can?
- Yes. Α
- Sometimes though, because of their failure Q of memory, there are limits to what they can tell you? 25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α

MR. JAS. YOUNG: Is that a question or statement?

Q Have you ever experienced that? Let me rephrase the question, Doctor.

Can failure of memory affect the accuracy or the reliability of a history?

- When you're taking a history from the patient, you can frequently tell just by talking to them whether they are cognizant of their past, if they are leaving points And yes, you can tell that, because they leave lapses of memory. You ask them Their mental status, an questions. examination of the mental status that you automatically take with your history. when you take a history, you can tell whether somebody can remember things, cannot remember things, how accurate they are, how quickly they respond to you. And I would have -- if there was any question, I would have put that in here.
- Q So if there was any question about Mrs. Wiley's ability to assist you in developing her history, you would have noted it?

Ĺ

		60
1	A	Yes.
2	Q ·	What about ignorance though? Can ignorance
3		affect the reliability of a history?
4	A	Ignorance for what?
5	Q	Well, is it possible that people are
6		ignorant of things that have occurred in
7		their past that might be related to their
8		ill health?
9	A	Ignorant or unknowing?
10	Q	Either. Unknowing. Let's start with
11		unknowing.
12	A	Unknowing, you mean they are not educated
13		enough to know what may have happened to
14		them?
15	Q	Or they are unaware of what may have
16	' !	happened to them or to what they may have
17		been exposed to or encountered in their
18		life.
19	A	It depends on the educational background of
20		that patient.
21	Q	Do you think that people's ignorance I
22		don't mean that in a pejorative sense or
23		their unknowingness can affect the
24		reliability or accuracy of a history?
25		MR. CROSS: I think that's been

asked and answered several times.

- A I don't quite understand your question.

 Most people, 99.9 percent of the patients,

 if they are a fifth grade education, can

 tell me what's been going on with them.
- Q Well, can they tell you if they have been exposed to polyvinylchloride?
- A Polyvinylchloride is a chemical term. If
 you asked a lay person that -- if I went and
 asked one of these other doctors, they may
 not know what that is. They may or may not.
 But that's a chemical term. You can't ask a
 patient that.
- Q I take it you asked Mrs. Wiley if she had been a smoker or drinker at any point in her life?
- A Yes.

- Q And besides smoking and drinking, what else -- let me ask you this, Doctor: Are smoking and drinking associated with the subsequent development of disease?
- A Can be, yes.
- Q Are there other substances or behaviors that are associated with the subsequent development of disease?

- A Secondhand smoke, "reminal" tobacco smoke, drug use, intravenous drug use.
 - Q Did you ask Mrs. Wiley if she was an intravenous drug user?
 - A No. If it's not there, I didn't ask her.
- To the extent there are other things that
 might be associated with subsequent
 development of disease, including lung
 diseases like cancer, if you had asked
 Mrs. Wiley about her history and she had
 provided you information, it would be here?
- A Most likely I did not ask intravenous drug use because this patient had a suspected back lesion. If she didn't have hepatitis -- and that was not along in my suspicions -- then I would not have asked that.
- Q Did you ask Mrs. Wiley if she had been exposed to so-called secondhand smoke?
- A Yes.
- Q Why did you ask her that?
- A I do that to all my patients.
- Q When did you start doing that?
 - A Probably in the late '80s, mid '80s. It's hard to say. I've been in practice since

- 1983. I may have asked before that when I was in my residency and fellowship. You would have to look at my other histories and physical examinations.
- Q She apparently told you that she had been exposed to secondhand smoke for approximately 12 years at the VA?
- A Yes.

- Q Those were her words?
- A If I put it down here, it was either her or her husband. She I think gave this history though. I know she did, because she was still awake and was able to talk to me.
- Q Could you have visualized and remembered this without referring to this? Or is this something that kind of helps you refresh your recollection as to what happened?
- A Do I remember this patient or do I remember this history?
- Q Do you remember this history?
- A I remember this history, yes.
- Q Why do you remember it?
- A Well, part of the problem is because of the patient. I remember -- I have multiple trauma patients. I remember what happened

- to them during their admissions as well. I mean, I just remember certain things. And you can ask my partners that too.
- Q Do you remember her telling you that she had a private office and had not been exposed to secondhand smoke over the last eight years?
- A I remember putting it down here, yes. I

 mean, it's down here. But later on, when I

 was talking to her husband, I remember him

 standing in the hallway telling me that she

 always left her door open. And this was not

 a private office.
- Q Let's back up, Doctor. In May of 1991, you asked Mrs. Wiley -- you took a history from Mrs. Wiley; isn't that right?
- A Yes.

- Q And she provided you with some information that you recorded and what we have marked as Exhibit 2; isn't that right?
- A Yes.
 - One of the things you asked her was if she was exposed to secondhand smoke?
- A Yes.
- Q Did you use the word "secondhand smoke" or was that her word?

- A I probably used "secondhand smoke."
- Q Your testimony is that she told you she was exposed to secondhand smoke for approximately 12 years at the VA?
- A Yes.

- Q And she also said to you at that time that she had been on a new job over the last eight years, therefore, and has had a private office and has not been exposed to secondhand smoke?
- A I put that there, yes.
- Q Because that's what she told you?
- A Yes.
- Q And her husband was in the room at the time, wasn't he?
- A She also told me that --

MR. JAS. YOUNG: I will object to the leading form of the question.

- A I don't know if her husband was in the room or not. I said if the husband was there, then he may have helped with the history.

 But I can't recall that he was there.
- Q That's my question: Can you tell me whether or not her husband was present when you took this history?

Q

I cannot tell you that, no. 1 Α 2 You also asked her about allergies, and she Q 3 told you her only allergy was sulfa? 4 Α Yes. What is sulfa? 5 Q Sulfa is an antibiotic. 6 Α So this then is about at or near the time Q you became involved in Mrs. Wiley's 8 9 treatment? Α 10 Yes. 11 When did you first meet her attorneys: Messrs. Young, Young, Young, 12 13 Cross, Howard, Dudley, or Wiley? MR. RILEY: Riley. 14 15 MR. OHLEMEYER: Riley, sorry. Maybe '93. I don't know. 16 I don't know. 17 Q Was it before Mrs. Wiley died? 18 Α No. 19 Q So it was after Mrs. Wiley died? It was several years after Mrs. Wiley died. 20 A Describe for me how that happened, how your 21 Q 22 first contact with any of those gentlemen 23 occurred. 24 I got a letter in the mail. Α

Do you have a copy of that letter?

1 Α I don't know. If it's not in there, I 2 probably don't have a copy. 3 Q What did the letter say? 4 Α As I recall, the letter said that they were 5 being retained by her husband. 6 Q To do what? 7 Α That's all it said. They were being 8 retained by the husband and that -- I don't 9 even know what the letter said. 10 Q Can you give me any idea when in 1993 you 11 received this letter? 12 MR. JAS. YOUNG: I will object. 13. That's been asked and answered. She said 14 she can't recall. 15 I can't remember. Α 16 Q Do you remember whether it was winter, 17 spring, summer, or fall? 18 Α I mean -- I don't know. I don't know. 19 MR. OHLEMEYER: Let me mark this as 20 Exhibit 3. 21 (Exhibit(s) 3 marked for 22 identification). 23 Q Doctor, let me hand you what we have marked 24 as Exhibit 3 and ask you if you can identify

that for us?

- A It was a dictation that I did.
- Q At or about when?
 - A May of '93.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q And is this something that you have produced to us this morning in connection with the deposition?
- A I don't know when I produced this, you know.
 We talked about this.
- Q Let me ask you this: Is that something that should be in your file in connection with your care and treatment of Mrs. Wiley?
- A We didn't have a hospital chart.
- Q Let's back up. It's clear, isn't it, that you have -- you brought that to the deposition this morning. I didn't bring it, right?
- A I have not seen this. I went through all those letters. I did not see this.
- Q You did not see that when?
- A Last evening or this morning, until now.
- Q Let me represent to you that that was in that stack of material. Have you seen that before?
- A Not for several years.
- Q When is the last time you saw it?

A	Well, it	probab	ly	Ic	an't	tell	you	when
	the last	time I	saw i	it,	becau	se I	have	not
	seen this	s for s	everal	l ye	ars.			

Q So your testimony is that --

MR. JAS. YOUNG: Excuse me,

Counsel. I'm confused about the document.

I think there is some confusion about when

this -- when the part of the chart was not

able to be found at one point. Then within

the last day, according to Dr. Turner, the

chart was found. I think this is -- is this

part of the chart that was found?

THE WITNESS: Yes. This was not there last night.

MR. JAS. YOUNG: Why don't you ask some preliminary questions?

MR. OHLEMEYER: Absolutely.

- Q Let me start here, Doctor. I have in front of me what we have marked as Exhibit 3, a progress note related to Mildred Wiley dated May 24, 1993.
- A Yes.
- Q Page 2 is labeled Progress Notes, Mildred Wiley, May 24, 1993.
- A Yes.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	ļ	
	·	. 70
1	Q	Attributed to Nicki C. Turner, M.D. And
2		then on the left-hand side, it says
3		"NCT:saw," right?
4	A,	Yes.
5	Q	There is no doubt that you dictated this?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	And your secretary or S.A.W., whoever that
8		is, transcribed it for you?
9	A	Yes.
10		MR. OHLEMEYER: I take it counsel
11		is familiar with this?
12		MR. JAS. YOUNG: No, I think we
13		haven't seen it because what happened was
14		let's put it this way: We were advised this

MR. OHLEMEYER: Produced.

morning that part of the file which had not

MR. JAS. YOUNG: -- available to the witness, could not be found by the witness -- strike that.

Dr. Turner, can you describe for us whether or not any materials with respect to Mildred Wiley's chart have been recently discovered by you and/or your office?

THE WITNESS: Yes, just this

been --

```
morning.
```

BY MR. OHLEMEYER:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q And what are they is a better question?
- Α I gave them to you.
- Q So they are here?
- Yes, but I haven't seen them. My question Α I don't know where these things were. That's the question.

MR. JAS. YOUNG: The point is you found these in a filing cabinet?

I don't even know if THE WITNESS: this was in there. I was back there reviewing it with Sylvia, and I didn't see this. Maybe I didn't look through every single page; I don't know. But they were not in there last night.

MR. JAS. YOUNG: This morning when you came in, you found some materials? THE WITNESS: Sylvia did, the secretary.

MR. JAS. YOUNG: That you had never seen before?

THE WITNESS: I may have seen them, but a long time ago. I gave you everything I had. Remember we went through those.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Let me ask counsel a question: Is it your position that this is a document that has not been previously provided to you?

MR. JAS. YOUNG: We haven't seen it yet, number one. Number two --

MR. OHLEMEYER: Let me ask a question then. Well, go ahead.

MR. JAS. YOUNG: Wait a minute.

Let's clear this up. We haven't seen this exhibit because you have shown it to the witness, but have just now given it to us.

We were advised this morning that

Dr. Turner found materials that heretofore

had been lost and after what was described

to us as a search by Dr. Turner to find the

file, just turned up somehow this morning.

So what those documents are that were found

this morning, we have not seen them.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Fair enough.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Off the record

(Discussion off the record from 11:01 a.m. to 11:02 a.m.)

MR. OHLEMEYER: Dr. Turner has produced this morning in response to the

request for production --

THE WITNESS: Let me rephrase that. This appeared in my file this morning. produced it for you because I found it. last night it was not there.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Okay. Dr. Turner has physically carried into the conference room a stack of material that is purportedly responsive to the Request for Production that was attached to the deposition notice.

We have marked one piece of that material Exhibit 3. I have a couple of other pieces here I want to mark as the next exhibits in order. And we will do that on the record.

MR. JAS. YOUNG: From that stack? MR. OHLEMEYER: From that stack, from that same stack. And we have three books on the table that were in that stack, the '84 Surgeon General's report; the '86 Surgeon General's report; and Glantz's book; the "Cigarette Papers."

What I would like to do -- and I think counsel agrees -- is to take this stack that Dr. Turner has her chart in front of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

her. And we can keep that here while we ask questions about it, but take the rest of this material, send it to Kinko's, make as many copies as everybody wants, bring one back, make it an exhibit, and then everybody will have a stack of whatever it is we need to have a stack of.

MR. JAS. YOUNG: I think that's agreeable. Although I would object to interrogating this witness on those materials that she said she inexplicably found this morning and hasn't even had a chance to look at.

MR. OHLEMEYER: I will give her a chance to look at anything we interrogate her on. And that's my point.

MR. JAS. YOUNG: I mean prior to the interrogation. I'm not talking about just handing it to her and ask her to read it.

MR. OHLEMEYER: We will give the doctor a chance to look at anything she wants to look at. But my thought is,

Doctor, if you would segregate the chart from this material, we will put everything

else in this stack and send it off to get copied.

(Exhibit(s) 4-8 marked for identification).

MR. JAS. YOUNG: If you don't mind, I would like the opportunity to ask her some preliminary questions to try and clear up this confusion about the missing chart, the location of the chart recently, and where we stand with the materials that were produced for this deposition.

MR. OHLEMEYER: You know, normally -- I'm a nice guy. Go ahead. Normally I wouldn't do that.

BY MR. JAS. YOUNG:

3

5

6

7

8

9

IO:

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q Doctor, was there ever a time that your office chart concerning Mildred Wiley became missing?
- A Yes.
 - Q And when was that?
 - A Well, we just were able to find it on microfilm. We were able to find it last Friday.
 - Q How long had it been missing?
- 25 A We've not been able to review the office

chart, whatever is left of the office chart, whatever the office chart is we had, for at least two years, two to three years probably.

- Q Had you during that period of time made a search for the file?
- A Yes.

- Q Would you term that an exhaustive search?
- A Yes, we looked at the microfilm; and we looked at the files where they were. And it was not there.
- Q Are you saying that it was not able to be located on the microfilm as well?
- A That's my understanding. I asked for the secretaries that worked for us to look everywhere that chart could be. And they said they could not find it.
- Q And then as I understand your testimony, this past Friday, less than four days ago, was the chart located on microfiche again?
- A Yes.
- Q And what occurred after that?
- A I had them make a copy and told them to contact you and make sure that you would have available for whatever you needed to do

with it and make a copy for myself as well as Dr. Songer since we had not seen it. 2 And make it available for the deposition 3 Q

> Α Yes.

today?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q And were you reviewing those materials last evening?
- Α Yes.
- What period of time did you review that 0 material?
- I reviewed a number of materials from 8:00 to about midnight last night or 12:30.
- And did you come in this morning and review 0 some of the materials again?
- Α Well, I had left -- some of the pages were missing from the articles. Well, some of the pages were missing. And from -- let me clarify.

You had left me a chart that you guys had delivered. I reviewed that. I cannot remember if I reviewed the chart from our 30 office. I have reviewed so much.

But some of the pages were missing, and I had left a note for Emily, who is my nurse, to call either you or call the

hospital and make sure we had a complete file.

And then she went into my office. And the chart was in the drawer last night that I had went through entirely. And it was all of a sudden just sitting there.

- Q When did she go in and find that?
- A 8:00 this morning or 8:15.
- Q You're saying at 8:00 o'clock this morning, there were materials that were in the file cabinet drawer that were not in there when you finished at 12:30 last night?
- A They were not there. I went through that whole file.
- Q And were those the materials that were in the rubber banded section and have been sent out to be copied?
- A Yes. Well, I don't know. They were in a rubber band. I don't know how much is what is what.
- Q They were sent with the materials that were just recently sent out to be copied.
- A Yes.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Or, for the record, they could be here in front of you?

- A Now, the hospital brought a whole -- the hospital -- we may have asked the hospital to make a copy of their chart too. So this may be all mixed together.
- Q When you reviewed the materials that showed up this morning that were not in the file cabinet at 12:30 last night, was what has been marked as Exhibit 3 in those materials?
- A No.

- Q So those materials, that document,

 Exhibit 3, was not even in the materials

 that mysteriously appeared in your file

 cabinet?
- A I have not seen this for I don't know how long.
- Q Was it the first time that you saw that when it was handed to you this morning during the course of your deposition?
- A For several years. For several years. I think I saw it in the file before it was lost, so-called lost. And then I have not seen it since until just now.
- Q Did you have an opportunity to examine and study the materials that were located this morning at 8:00 that were not in your file

cabinet last night at 12:30?

- A I went through them very quickly. And if this is it, I went through them. This was not there. I mean, I have not seen this.
- Q What is this?

A This is an emergency room physician -emergency room chart. I have not seen some
of this, unless this was from -- this was
left -- we will have to talk to Sylvia and
figure out which was what. But this I have
not seen.

MR. OHLEMEYER: I don't want to interrupt. When you say "this" --

MR. JAS. YOUNG: When you say "this," it doesn't mean anything.

A I'm sorry, the emergency room chart.

MR. JAS. YOUNG: Let's mark them.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Show me what you are referring to as "this." I mean, hand it to me.

THE WITNESS: These papers.

MR. OHLEMEYER: These two pieces of

THE WITNESS: Yes.

A But the point is, I do not understand -- I

paper?

can't tell you -- these have all been mixed together by people. I can't tell you what of this was in the rubber band that was found in my desk or in my file and what was from the hospital and what you guys brought. I can't tell you what is what.

MR. OHLEMEYER: To be fair, Doctor, we came in this morning. And you gave us a stack of stuff. And you pulled stacks out of your briefcase.

THE WITNESS: This was not there.

I will tell you that. Whatever was left

was -- it was in a yellow envelope. That

was what they -- exactly what you gave me

that you delivered to my office is what was

in the yellow envelope.

MR. JAS. YOUNG: That has been sent out for copying?

THE WITNESS: Probably.

MR. OHLEMEYER: My turn?

MR. JAS. YOUNG: Well, let's mark those and have her identify those things that were not in there.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Right.

BY MR. JAS. YOUNG:

IO.

· 23

Q	As I understand it, those documents that are
	being marked, Doctor, are documents that
	were not in the rubber banded material that
	mysteriously showed up in your file cabinet
	this morning?

A I can't tell if those were from the hospital or from the rubber banded material. They were not in what I reviewed last evening.

I'm sorry it's so confusing. All of this -- suddenly appeared.

MR. OHLEMEYER: I will hand the court reporter the two pieces of paper the doctor handed to me. And we will mark those as the next two exhibits in order.

(Exhibit(s) 9-10 marked for identification).

BY MR. OHLEMEYER:

Doctor, we have taken a rather long break.

Mr. Young has asked you some questions. And now I'm going to ask you questions again.

First, let me ask you if there is a question I ask you you don't understand, will you let me know?

- A Yes.
- Q You referred to the chart a number of times

when Mr. Young was asking you questions.

What do you mean by the chart? Is that -do you mean three or is something more than

Exhibit 3?

- A Are you talking about a hospital chart, an office chart?
- Q You kept saying the chart was missing.
- A Our office chart was missing.
- Q And what is contained in the office chart?
- A Well, there is probably a few X-ray reports, whatever was put in that chart about this patient.
- Q When and how did you determine it was missing?
- A I can't even remember that. But it was several years -- a couple years ago when I was asked to come up with all the papers that had to do with this case.
- Q Was it at or near the time that you were asked to prepare the letter that you wrote dated July 20th, 1993, to whom it may concern, concerning the request from the U.S. Department of Labor for information about Mrs. Wiley's death?
- A I cannot recall.

- Q Is Exhibit 3 something that should have been in your office chart?
- A Usually anything that has to do with the patient we leave in the chart.
- O Do you know if there is anything else that is missing from the chart, to your knowledge, or does not appear to be in the material that you have collected with respect to Mrs. Wiley in the recent past?
- A I can't tell you that because I can't remember that, if there was additional records that may have come from the hospital or from the attorneys or you guys.
- Q Do you recall dictating progress notes after Mrs. Wiley died in addition to those that we have marked as Exhibit 3?
- A I cannot recall, but I may have. I cannot recall. Without the chart here, I cannot recall.
- Q If you had done that, should those notes be in the chart?
- A You would expect they would be. If I dictate, they are done by a stenographer at the office; and everything is kept at the chart.

- Q What is your secretary's name?
- A I have several. Sylvia is the one in the phone room.
- Q Sorry. Who is the secretary that prepared this material for you or helped you look for the material that was missing?
- A Well, Sylvia would have been one of those individuals. Before Sylvia, there would have been somebody else. We have people that are turning over in the office.
- Q What is Sylvia's last name?
- A I don't know. I'm not very good at names.
- Q Am I correct that at some point in time, between the time you met Mrs. Wiley's attorneys and today, they have prepared and sent to you a chart with respect to Mrs. Wiley?
- A They sent us copies of the hospital chart I believe.
- Q Do you have that somewhere in a form that you can say this is what the lawyers sent me?
- A Well, it was in an envelope, a yellow envelope, that I thought I handed to you. This is not it. It was in a plain yellow

envelope with my name on it.

Q You would expect to find an envelope in the

I0

- material we sent out to copy with your name on it?
- A No, I handed it to you with everything else.

 If it came out of that briefcase, I handed it to you.
- Q And everything you have given to me, Dr. Turner, we have agreed --

MR. WAGNER: Wait a minute.

There's more.

A Here it is here. That's what I received from the attorneys.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Let me do this.

I'm going to put these documents back in the envelope, and we will mark this as the next in order.

(Exhibit(s) 11 marked for identification).

- Q For the record, Doctor, we have marked as

 Exhibit 11 what you believe to have been the
 record sent to you from Mrs. Wiley's

 attorneys?
- A Yes. And I just received those last week or last week probably, early last week or

whenever.

- Q Do you know from where they obtained these records?
- A I would surmise from the hospital chart.
- Q Was there a point in time, do you recall, that people came to your office to collect records pursuant to an authorization with respect to Mrs. Wiley?
- A I'm not aware of that. They may have.

 Sometimes I'm gone, and things happen that I would not be able to tell you that.
- Q It's fair to say that Exhibit 3 was not contained within the material sent to you by the attorneys that we have marked as Exhibit 11?
- A That was definitely not there, no.
- Q Can you recall why you prepared Exhibit 3?
- A The question arose of whether in my opinion this patient's death was caused by secondhand smoke. And in that capacity, I contacted individuals, pathologists, experts in the field before I rendered that opinion.
- Q And did that question arise at or near the date of Exhibit 3, May 1993?
- A Around there I suppose.

- Q How did that question arise?
 - A They just asked me if I felt that this case was related to secondhand smoke.
 - Q And who is "they"?
 - A The attorneys.
 - Q And were they the first people that had asked you that question?
 - A No, her husband did.
 - Q When did he ask you that question?
- 10 A The day she died or soon before she died.
 - Q What did you tell him?
 - A I felt that that was the only explanation that I had.
 - Q Did you dictate a progress note with respect to that conversation?
 - A No.

- Q Is there any record that describes or indicates that you told Mr. Wiley on the day Mrs. Wiley died that you had an opinion about the cause of her death?
- A I put it in my discharge summary, and I put it in the -- when I wrote the death -- the final discharge, when we fill out the final page I believe. I would have to find that.
- Q Let me hand you what we will mark as the

next exhibit in order, which will be Exhibit 12.

(Exhibit(s) 12 marked for identification).

- Q Doctor, this exhibit is the death summary?
- A Yes.
- Q That you dictated; is that right?
- A Yes.

2

5

6

7

8

16

- 9 On or about July 21st?
- 10 A Yes.
- Q When did Mrs. Wiley die?
- A She died -- I would have to look here. I think she died -- do you have the final?
- Q It's probably -- no, it's not on here. I'm sorry, June 24th.
 - A That's when she died.
 - Q So this was dictated a month after she died?
- 18 A Yes.
- Q You see down there near the bottom of the page where it says, "We had to keep pushing the analgesics"?
- 22 A Yes.
- Q What does that mean?
- 24 A I can't find it.
- 25 Q Three lines up from the bottom, "We had to

- keep pushing the analgesics."
 - A Because she was in agony. She was in horrible, horrible pain.
 - Q Do you see in the middle of page there where it says, "The patient was seen by Dr. Songer in consultation"?
 - A Yes.

- Q It says, "He did not feel that this was breast and the question arose whether this may have been primary lung." Can you tell me where that information comes from, how you obtained the information you put in those two sentences?
- A That he did not feel this was breast?
- Q Yes.
 - A We discussed this. And we went through the differential of what could probably be the etiology of her primary.
 - Q And when did you do that?
 - A Throughout her admission, throughout her hospitalization.
 - Q And is it fair to say throughout her hospitalization, there was some uncertainty as to where Mrs. Wiley's primary tumor may have arisen?

MR. JAS. YOUNG: I object to the form of the question.

A Your question is --

- Q Throughout Mrs. Wiley's hospitalization, was there some discussion among her doctors and/or some uncertainty about the primary site of her cancer?
- A Her primary site was lung.
- Q That's your opinion, Doctor. Upon what do you base it?
- A Well, because when I did a bronchoscopy, the airway was full of tumor. If it was a metastatic lesion, it would have been peripheral. And it was not peripheral.
- Q Is it your opinion, Doctor, that Mrs. Wiley presented with an endobronchial lesion?
- A Yes.

- Q And tell me what that means in laymen's terms.
- A That means that the growth was from the airway, itself.
- Q And is it your opinion that that cancer was an adenocarcinoma?
- A After our biopsies and the transthoracic biopsy, yes.

Q	What	percentage	of	endobronchial	lesions	are
	aden	ocarcinomas:	?			

- A I can't tell you that. Normally adenocarcinoma is peripheral. Normally adenocarcinomas are a peripheral lesion.

 The fact this was an endobronchial lesion was very surprising. And the fact is that's one of the primary reasons, besides the fact it was adenocarcinoma and because of her history, that I felt that this was related to secondhand smoke.
- Q If this were not an endobronchial lesion, would you still be of the opinion that it was primary to the lung?

MR. JAS. YOUNG: I will object.
That's calling for speculation. She has
already testified it was an endobronchial
lesion.

- Q Let me ask you to assume that this was not an endobronchial lesion. If that were the case, would you still be of the opinion this was a primary carcinoma of the lung?
- A If it was not an endobronchial lesion, where would it be situated at?
- Q My question, Doctor, is if it were not an

endobronchial lesion, do you have an opinion as to whether it was a primary carcinoma of the lung?

MR. JAS. YOUNG: I will object to the question because it's vague and it's not specific enough to allow an appropriate answer.

- Q Do you understand the question, Doctor?
- A You asked if this was not an endobronchial lesion, would I still consider this as a primary lung?
- Q Primary lung cancer.
- 13 A Yes.

- Q You would?
- 15 A Yes.
 - Q Would you still consider it to have been secondary to secondhand smoke?
 - A I think that -- I'm not an epidemiologist, obviously. But the fact that it was a adenocarcinoma, because of her exposure, because there was no other source, I would say it would be highly suspicious that it was related to secondhand smoke.
 - Q Could you say it was with reasonable certainty?

A Yes.

- Q No other source of --
 - A She was not a primary smoker. If she had been a primary smoker, then possibly that would have been related to that. We did not find it in her breast. Everything else pointed to a primary lung.
 - Q I'm going to get into that in a little more detail in a minute. But what about other risk factors for lung cancer? Do you know whether she demonstrated or had encountered any other risk factors for lung cancer in her life?
 - A Ninety percent of lung cancers are related to tobacco. What other risk factors would there be?
 - Q What percentage of cigarette smokers develop lung cancer, Doctor?
 - A Approximately 10 to 15 percent.
 - Q What percentage of lung cancers occur in nonsmokers?
 - A I don't know the exact percentage. It
 depends obviously on their risk factors as
 well. If they are around secondhand smoke,
 I consider them a very high --

Possibility? Q

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Possibility. Not possibility, but that is a Α risk factor. I think you have to take everything in context. You can't think everything -- you have to look at the whole picture.
- Q And that's my question. What other parts of the picture did you have available to you in July of 1991 when you concluded that Mrs. Wiley's cancer was a metastatic adenocarcinoma of the lung, secondary to secondhand smoke?
- Α Because that was the only answer that I could come up with. I mean, it was not pancreatic.
- Let me stop you there for a minute. I don't mean to interrupt. Let's assume for the sake of this discussion that it was a primary adenocarcinoma of the lung. What other pieces of the picture did you have available to you when you determined it was secondary to secondhand smoke?

THE WITNESS: Can I ask a favor? Can I review this chart? Because everything seems to be coming -- can I review the chart

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

because it seems to me like I have gotten pieces. Is that possible before I answer?

MR. OHLEMEYER: I would have expected, Doctor, these attorneys might have suggested you do that before the deposition.

THE WITNESS: I did, but the chart was not available.

> MR. JAS. YOUNG: Wait a minute

MR. OHLEMEYER: Let me finish my I'm perfectly happy to let you take as much time as you would like and review anything you would like to review.

THE WITNESS: Let me tell you this chart was not available. I have reviewed the chart that was made available to me. We called over this morning, and the hospital surprisingly loses the chart again. You can ask Sylvia about this. It's awful funny this stuff happens. I've been trying to be prepared for this deposition. Believe me.

MR. JAS. YOUNG: I suggest we take a lunch break and allow her time to organize the chart in a manner that she can testify from it. Otherwise, it's not to her benefit or your benefit to continue the deposition.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. OHLEMEYER: Let me do this. Let's move on to some other areas of inquiry, Doctor. By the time we get to a lunch break --

MR. JAS. YOUNG: I feel we should take a lunch break at this time so the doctor has --

MR. OHLEMEYER: Counsel, we have a lot to cover and a very short period of time to do it in. And I'm not going to spend any more time than I need. We will take a lunch The doctor can spend as much time as break. she needs. But I have some questions I want to ask her before we break for lunch.

MR. JAS. YOUNG: It's 10 till It's an appropriate time to take a lunch break. She is not able to talk about the documents in a coherent fashion, disorganized the way they are. This is an appropriate time to let her reorganize the documents so that she can give clear answers to you.

MR. OHLEMEYER: I have no disagreement with that, counsel. What I want to do before we break for lunch is ask some questions about Exhibit 3, which is an exhibit you and she had a lot of time to talk about during a break.

Before we break for lunch, I have a short number of questions I want to ask about it.

MR. JAS. YOUNG: Exhibit 3 is one of the things that she says she hadn't had a chance to review.

MR. OHLEMEYER: I will not ask her about the substance of Exhibit 3. I want to establish some facts before we move on.

BY MR. OHLEMEYER:

- Q Dr. Turner, is Exhibit 3 something that would be on the microfiche or microfilm you described for us that contains the chart?
- A I can't tell you. You need to find out from what -- see again, last night, we need to find out where the papers are they were able to copy from the microfilm and see if that was on there. I have not seen that piece of paper. So somebody like Sylvia would be able to say, "Here's the microfilm."
- Q And then we could take the microfilm and compare it to the physical records that

Sylvia collected?

A Yes.

- Q And then we could determine whether or if Exhibit 3 was part of any of that?
- A Yes.
- Q If it wasn't on the microfilm and it's not in the records Sylvia collected, where do you think it came from?

MR. JAS. YOUNG: I will object. You are asking her to speculate.

- A I don't know.
- Q Do you have a file on Mildred Wiley somewhere else that Sylvia wouldn't have had access to?
- A Sylvia doesn't normally have access to my files. I have turned over everything that I had, several months ago, to the attorneys so they could give you copies of everything.

 And if that was in that file, it would have been turned over to you.
- Q So as we sit here today, you don't think this was something you gave to the attorneys several months ago, this being Exhibit 3?
- A No.

THE WITNESS: Had you seen that?

MR. R	ILEY: I'v	e never	seen	it.
-------	-----------	---------	------	-----

- Q When you dictated this, do you have any record of who you would have shared this with, Exhibit 3? Did you send it to anybody?
- A No, not that I am aware of.
- Q Do you have a standard procedure whereby your secretary takes these kinds of notes and put them into the file?
- A They would be put into the chart.
- Q So it would have been standard procedure for you to have dictated this and your secretary to put it into the chart at or near the time it was dictated?
- A Yes.
- Q How often do you dictate progress notes on patients who have died two years before the date of the dictation?
- A It depends on what's happening with them.

 If there's legal -- any type of legal or if if I've had family discussions, I have had patients that families call me regarding what they did at the time, and I dictate things there for legal purposes just so we have documentation.

IO

- Q So at this point in time, you were aware of the fact that this case was connected in some way to litigation?
- A Well, not until -- no, not at that time.

 The question arose is whether I felt that
 this case was related to secondhand smoke.
- Q Let me ask you this: And I will give you a chance to read this at lunch. But if the progress report or notes describe a discussion you had with Mr. Riley of Young & Riley, then it certainly occurred after they had contacted you about their representation in this matter?
- A Their question was -- they said they had been retained as the attorneys and that did I feel that this was related to secondhand smoke. And that's what this dictation is about.
- Q But you had already said that in your death summary, right?
- A Yes.
- Q Why didn't you just send them the death summary?
- A I am sure they had the death summary. I would think they would have. Most attorneys

do that, don't they? They make some type of homework before they call and start up something?

- The good ones do. At some point then after Q you dictated it, it became lost?
- Sometime, yes. A

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- And the reason you believe it became lost is Q because you discovered it this morning after having reviewed --
- I discovered it when you handed it to me. Α
- You will have to let me finish. And that's my point is in the interim, since May of '93, and the point in time where I handed Exhibit 3 to you, you had looked through the chart and it, according to your recollection, wasn't there?
- The chart that we had in this office Α you can ask Dr. Songer the same thing could not find. If this wasn't part of the chart, then obviously it didn't end up on microfilm or this would be a copy. This is an original. And I don't know where it went.

It was not in my chart last night. It was not in my files last night. The first

time I saw it is when you handed it to me just now.

MR. JAS. YOUNG: This being Exhibit 3.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Exactly.

- Q Is it possible, Doctor, you dictated additional progress notes between May of '93 and October 21, 1997, that relate to Mildred Wiley that became lost?
- A I'm not aware of any. There could be.

 Certainly not within the last three years,

 three to four years. Since 1993 or 1994,

 most likely not, because I have not -- I've

 gone about my practice.
- Q What about prior to '93?
- A Unless there was a specific question regarding that patient, there was no reason to.
- Q Did you meet with the attorneys,

 Mrs. Wiley's attorneys, in advance of this

 deposition to describe or discuss the

 medical records or your opinions?
- A I think I have met maybe two to three times in the last -- since whenever, since I first found out about this chart -- this case. A

couple times ago, they asked me for all the records that I had. I brought a whole file in. They went through them. And I think they were going to send you all these.

- Q Have you ever talked with any other individuals who have been identified to you as potential witnesses in this case?
- A Have I talked to anybody? Just Dr. Songer.
- Q What about Dr. Burns? Do you know Dr. Burns, David Burns?
- A I remember the name. But I don't know. I mean, it's a very long time ago.
- Q What did you tell Mr. Wiley's attorneys about Exhibit 3 during the break we took after we marked it and identified it as an exhibit?
- A I don't know where it came from. I mean, I dictated it. I know I dictated it. And I have no idea where it came from after that. I have not seen it for several years.
- Q Did you have a chance to read it during the break?
- A Yes.
- Q Does it refresh your recollection as to when and why and how you prepared it?

- A Again the question arose of whether this case was related to secondhand smoke. This is that whole -- that is why this was dictated.
- Q And was that a question posed to you by the attorneys?
- A Yes.

- Q We will take a break here in a second. You see the first sentence here, it says, "A long discussion ensued"?
- A Yes.
- Q Can you explain to me what that means?
 - A Well, I had discussions with Dr. Songer.

 And I also had discussions with

 Dr. Stephens. I was asking several of my

 partners, Dr. Kocoshis, regarding this case

 because I wanted to make sure that they

 concurred and that all the questions could

 be answered.
 - Q The questions about the cause of Mrs. Wiley's cancer?
- A Yes.
 - Q And you wanted to be sure they concurred with your opinion.
- A No, not my opinion. The evidence.

Q	From	that	evidence	you	were	going	to	develop
	an or	n?						

- A I had already developed the opinion. But you need other individuals, pathologists, to concur, to review everything again.
- Q So you had developed the opinion before you talked with the doctors about assembling the evidence?
- A Yes.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Let's take a lunch break.

(The deposition recessed for lunch from 11:56 a.m. to. 1:25 p.m.)

MR. OHLEMEYER:

BY MR. OHLEMEYER:

- Q Dr. Turner, if you don't understand a question I ask you, will you let me know?
- A Yes.

MR. HOWARD: At this time, the plaintiff would move for a continuation of this deposition until a later date.

Documents have mysteriously appeared this morning according to Dr. Turner. Now there's been some confusion as to which documents were missing. She has not had an

opportunity to review those documents for some three years.

Furthermore, Dr. Songer's deposition is scheduled for tomorrow. They share the file. Dr. Songer has not had an opportunity to review those documents. It would be our request that all of the documents that are here on the table that have been produced here this morning, that we have one set that everybody agrees on as all of the records.

There have been some records

produced -- and I think that was Exhibit

No. 3 -- which this witness had not seen

for three years, which appears to be an

original copy and not a microfiche copy.

It's a document that none of the

plaintiffs' attorneys when we requested the

file, that part of the file that

mysteriously appeared this morning was

missing from that file and appeared here

today.

I think in all fairness to the plaintiffs, to this witness, and to Dr. Songer, that his deposition should be

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

continued; and she should have an opportunity, rather than to be handed a document that she hasn't seen for three years and asked about a statement or something there, that she should be able to have an opportunity to review that.

Doctor, have I pretty much stated what's happened here today as far as the missing file?

> THE WITNESS: Yes.

And it's now your MR. HOWARD: opinion this is mixed up, and you don't know which is from what and what you have reviewed and what you haven't had an opportunity to review?

> THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. HOWARD: Would you like opportunity to have this entire file for you to review and continue the deposition until a later date?

> THE WITNESS: Yes.

Mr. Howard, I MR. OHLEMEYER: obviously cannot force the witness to remain and be deposed. She has been designated as an expert on behalf of your client.

Likewise, I can't force Dr. Songer to appear for the deposition. Although, there may be some discussion that needs to be had about whether or if he has been subpoensed or you have acquiesced in producing him as if he were subpoensed.

But let me say this: There is a discovery cutoff in this case of

November 4th. There is a variety -
there's a lot of testimony we could take from this witness that has nothing to do with Exhibit 3. It has nothing to do perhaps with the facts specific to

Mrs. Wiley contained in the medical records that you have described.

And I would encourage you -- and I would be happy to give you as much time as you need to talk with your cocounsel to think about it -- to allow us to continue as much of this deposition as we can fairly continue today. The witness and her lawyers are certainly free to defer questions until and unless she has an opportunity to review additional information.

But at this point, I would prefer to continue questioning in areas we can continue questioning, in order to make some progress toward completing discovery in this case in a timely manner. I would also ask that before we adjourn this deposition, if that's what you decide to do, that you provide us with some dates in advance of November 4th when we can continue it.

But I would really encourage you all to talk amongst yourselves and talk with the doctor about proceeding with as much as this deposition as can be accomplished in advance of the doctor's review of the casespecific medical records.

MR. HOWARD: You would want to proceed without referring to any documents, any of her records?

MR. OHLEMEYER: There are some questions I can ask the doctor that have nothing to do with the medical records or her diagnosis and treatment of Mrs. Wiley.

And certainly with the understanding that any progress is better than no progress, I think we can certainly do that

And when it's appropriate, the doctor can certainly say, "I can't answer that question until and unless you give me a chance to look at the records."

But I think there's a significant amount of testimony that we could take that has nothing to do with the facts or opinions described in the records in front of her that might help move the case along.

MR. HOWARD: We have had quite a bit of that already I think, testimony that had nothing to do with Wiley's records. I don't see how meaningful it would be for us to stay here if you're not going to be asking her questions that would require her to rely upon her medical records.

MR. OHLEMEYER: If what you are telling me -- see that's the problem here.

This witness has been proffered as something more than a fact witness. She has opinions. She has opinions that are based on things that have nothing to do with these medical records. I would like an opportunity to inquire about those opinions. And I think I'm entitled to inquire about her

qualifications, about her background, about her education, about her experience, about her potential bias.

There are a lot of things that I think are fair subjects of inquiry that aren't related to these specific records. I'm a reasonable person, and we're all reasonable people. I think amongst this group of people, making some progress this afternoon would be preferable to going home.

MR. HOWARD: Okay. But I don't really see the purpose of doing that. If we are going to have to come back here anyway, why would we waste our time here having you ask questions that have nothing to do with the medical records. If we have got to come back for that anyway, can't we do that another day and you can ask her more about her qualifications and --

MR. OHLEMEYER: Sorry to interrupt.

I'm not sure that all of that could be accomplished in a day. It seems to me anything we can accomplish today is another hour we won't have to accomplish down the road. And it would be the fairest and most

appropriate use of everybody's time.

I mean, you've chosen the date.

You've produced the witness. You

presumably had the witness prepared to

describe the opinions, the facts, the bases

of her opinions. Some of those opinions

concededly have to do with medical records

she would like a chance to review. Others

of those opinions don't. I think it would

be the most appropriate use of everybody's

time, rather than cancelling two days of

depositions, to proceed.

MR. HOWARD: I guess maybe I need to understand more of what you plan to ask. You're saying you're going to ask her opinions she might hold concerning Mildred Wiley's condition. But those opinions would be drawn from the records that I think she should have a chance to review.

MR. OHLEMEYER: There are a number of opinions this witness has expressed in the letter that has been provided to us as in lieu of her 26(b)(4) interrogatory response. Those opinions are not directly related to the medical records. Presumably,

ΙO

ΙI

the witness could be -- could testify about those opinions, the basis for those opinions, without reference to or resort to information from those medical records.

To the extent that we've been given that letter and told it is the expression of this witness's opinions, I think that I should be -- and I had arrived today prepared to ask about and I assume you had prepared the witness to testify about those.

MR. HOWARD: You arrived with some documents that we never saw; that the witness hadn't seen for three years.

MR. OHLEMEYER: I don't want to interrupt. Let's make this very clear. I arrived with nothing. Every document that has been marked as an exhibit and is on the table right here was given to us this morning by the witness. And the witness has testified to that. I did not arrive with Exhibit 3. I want to make sure that's very clear.

MR. HOWARD: Exhibit 3, did you give that document to Mr. Ohlemeyer this

morning?

THE WITNESS: I'm not aware that I did. I have not seen that document for over three years.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Now, wait a minute.

Let's make this very clear, gentlemen. You were witnesses. And if you want, we will take everybody's deposition in the room.

You saw what the witness handed to me. You saw that we carried it over and put it on the table. And you saw that we started asking questions about it.

I don't think of you are seriously telling me and suggesting to me that I arrived with Exhibit 3 this morning. Is that the record you are trying to make?

MR. HOWARD: I'm not suggesting anything. That's what the witness said. She did not give you document 3.

Mr. Ohlemeyer, I know you asked the gentleman behind you -- he had some of the records. You asked him, "Give me tab three," or something like that. The witness sat right there. And we can check the transcript.

MR. OHLEMEYER: The witness did not hand me Exhibit 3. Exhibit 3 was found within the materials that the witness provided us this morning from her briefcase and from the other materials that we produced.

THE WITNESS: I have not seen that letter or that note for three years. I'm just telling you. And I have gone through those files.

MR. OHLEMEYER: I don't disagree with you, Doctor. Mr. Howard, that's not the issue. The issue at this point isn't where Exhibit 3 came from. It is the doctor's dictation.

MR. HOWARD: We want to make sure we have everything here; that we have a chance to review; that she has a chance to review in its totality so she won't be a handed document and asked about it. I think if we are going to have to come back another day, we might as well come back and do it all. If you were going to do it all in one day today, you can do it all in another day.

MR. OHLEMEYER: If we are coming

back another day so that your expert can testify about the subject matter and basis of her opinions that have been expressed to us in her letter, that was described to us as surrogate for her 26(b)(4) response, we are doing it at your expense, not our expense, because we came here today at our expense to take a deposition that had been described to us as a deposition of this witness as an expert in this case.

MR. HOWARD: And I think she has every right to have in front of her all of the documents and have a chance to review all of those documents before you interrogate on those opinions.

MR. OHLEMEYER: You had an obligation to prepare her to do that before you brought us all here at our expense to do that.

MR. YOUNG: The evidence is that the records were found mysteriously --

MR. OHLEMEYER: A record.

MR. YOUNG: Not a record, a stack of rubber banded records that were found in the bottom of her drawer.

As far as the time is concerned, we were told six hours was the time limit that was necessary to take the deposition today. In fact, I said we had four available. I was told you better make it six.

> We've done two and a half hours. don't see why you don't feel as though the interrogation can be finished in a day's time the next time we get together.

MR. OHLEMEYER: That's not an issue we need to decide today. What we are here today is to take a deposition of a woman who has been described to us as having certain opinions. And those opinions are described in her letter of July 20, 1993.

Now, I want to ask this witness questions about those opinions. Some of those questions may bear upon medical records that you and the witness have told us she wants more time to review. agree to disagree about whether or if that's an appropriate preparation of an expert.

My point is this: There are questions that can be asked. There is testimony,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

IO

there are opinions that can be inquired of that have nothing to do with those records. We're here. We have paid to be here. Our clients are paying us to be here. We're entitled to ask those questions.

If you want to adjourn this deposition and Dr. Songer's deposition, my suggestion is that you may be doing it at your expense, not my expense. I can't make this deposition continue. We haven't subpoensed this witness. The next time we depose her we will.

All I'm asking you to do, gentlemen, is to take a minute, talk amongst yourselves, and decide if everybody's time might not be better spent by us using a few hours this afternoon to inquire of this witness as to other opinions and other facts and other bases that she may have for those opinions that can be inquired of without resorting to those medical records.

MR. YOUNG: We will talk. But I will tell you that they are inextricably -- the issues are inextricably intertwined with the medical records that concern Mildred

Wiley. And, therefore, it's hit or miss.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Mr. Young, I don't want to interrupt. No, it's not. What this witness knows about lung cancer and the etiology of lung cancer is not inextricably intertwined with these medical records.

What this witness studied in medical school, what this witness may hold as a bias or a prejudice has nothing to do with these medical records. Those are all fair areas of inquiry. You know they are fair areas of inquiry. And they could be accomplished today without any additional wasting of this witness's time or our time.

The fact of the matter is if this were September 10th, it would be a different question. But it's October 21st. And we have got a lot to do and a real short period of time to do it. All I'm suggesting is you guys talk about whether we can't make better use of this afternoon than everybody going home.

MR. TITTLE: Let me say two or three things, too, because you alluded. I don't think it's fair to say we had any

agreement that this would only be six hours.

We had a conversation about time, and I

think we were talking approximately.

Secondly, the witness is here under a subpoena. Bill misspoke. There was a subpoena delivered to her office. And I wrote to Will Riley and said you can assume that subpoena is continued and got no objection, so she is continued.

As for Exhibit 3, I will tell you I found it in the stack of documents that the doctor handed over to Bill Ohlemeyer when we walked this room. I'm the person who found it. It was buried down in the middle of the stack, the stack that she carried into this room.

MR. WAGNER: I want to say on behalf of R.J. Reynolds that we certainly object to this deposition being continued.

And the record in this case is quite clear. The only document that this witness has expressed some surprise about as not having seen for a while is Exhibit 3. She is and should be familiar with the medical chart that's involved in this case. It's

present here in the room.

One of the things we talked about this morning that's on the record is she wanted a chance to review that over the noon hour. Presumably she has. I personally don't see why she can't be asked questions about anything and everything.

She's a doctor. Her recollection can be refreshed by looking at whatever documents she wants to look at. And there isn't any real need for any kind of continuance to do anything. The only document that's been talked about is one she hasn't seen for a while, which she admits is her document that she dictated, is Exhibit 3. There's no ground for continuing this deposition.

Everybody has traveled long distances to be here. We have made arrangements to do this. The discovery cutoff in this case is November 4th. And we should continue with this deposition.

MR. BYRON: On behalf of CTR, I wish to also give the same objection. It's real clear to me that there's no real basis

here for the continuance of this deposition.

Everybody should have come here prepared,

including the witness.

And it's her progress notes that we were talking about in Exhibit 3. We're entitled to her recollection and also to test her memory. And if after she reviews that document, I'd be very surprised to hear her say that she can't remember what she might have written back when she did the progress note. It's isn't our document. It's her document.

THE WITNESS: I did not say I cannot remember. I just said I had not seen that for three years.

MR. HOWARD: How many of you would feel comfortable representing your client to come to a deposition by subpoena or whatever. And you can say this is our witness. We didn't manufacture her. She is a fact witness.

How many of you gentlemen would feel comfortable coming to a deposition when a stack of documents that you had never seen and a witness that's going to give

testimony on is going to be pulled out? Is that giving us an opportunity to fairly represent our client? If there's documents -- when we asked for them, they weren't there. The file was lost. They have never been there.

They mysteriously appear this morning.

And we have never as attorneys representing Wiley, never had the opportunity to even review those documents. So how many of you would feel comfortable? Naturally, you can sit there and say we had the documents.

And it's unfair to continue this deposition. I'm talking about basic fairness as a lawyer that we should have the right to go through those documents too.

She's testified that she didn't see that document; that those documents appeared this morning. And you can say we had a duty to prepare her. How can we prepare her on documents we never even had access to?

MR. OHLEMEYER: That's my point.

There's a way to make progress here without anybody having to cast aspersions on the

witness's preparation, on her lawyers'
preparation, or on our preparation by I
think I have graciously, and perhaps in
contrast to what Mr. Wagner has said, have
agreed to defer questioning on medical
records. I think with the exception of
Exhibit 3, the medical records we're talking
about are records that have been in your
possession and in our possession for some
time.

Whether or if they have been in the doctor's possession is a different question. But my point is this doctor has been produced as an expert. She has been held out to us as an expert. There are opinions that you are all going to want to offer at trial that are not inextricably related to those records. I want an opportunity to inquire about those opinions.

It seems to me that would be the best and fairest and most expeditious use of everybody's time. All I'm suggesting is we all stop talking and you all take a minute and discuss the matter. I mean, I can't

make you stay here.

MR. HOWARD: Do you want to caucus?

MR. YOUNG: All right.

(A recess from 1:41 p.m. to 1:43 p.m. was taken.)

MR. CROSS: From the plaintiffs'
perspective, we don't have any intention of
going forward with this deposition today.
We can go around the table, and all of us
can give our respective reasons why we
object or whatever. But the bottom line is
there's a whole raft of documents that
showed up for the first time this morning
that this witness hasn't seen. We don't
know whether we have seen them or not.

You can say there are no other

documents beside Exhibit 3 we have not had

an opportunity to see and the witness has

not been able to see. But we don't know

that. And we're not going to be able to

know that until we have an opportunity to

go through them all.

Now, you can say she's being produced as an expert. To some extent, perhaps she is. I'm not associated with that part of

the case. However, I think we've got the same problem with a whole herd of other documents. We don't know to what extent the documents that she is relying upon to give these opinions have showed up in documents.

Now, you have had a good time this morning asking her questions from documents that she hasn't had an opportunity to see yet before she is expected to answer the question. I don't think it's fair at all she be asked to render opinions, give any kind of comment on anything, until she has had an opportunity to organize this material that's been given to her. And we can explore for a moment the circumstances surrounding this.

Plaintiffs are going to suggest to the witness, again, that we continue this deposition to a later date. We do not have any intention of paying the cost of associated counsel coming back here.

And if you want to, we can try and enlist the Court's assistance this afternoon to rule on some of these issues.

http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/err07ae0/pdfw.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lmjl0001

But that seems to me to be where we should go with this rather than sitting here and arguing with each other on the record.

MR. OHLEMEYER: A couple of questions. And I realize you may not be associated with this part of the case. Is this witness expected to offer expert testimony at the trial of this case or is she a fact witness?

MR. YOUNG: She is a fact witness that will talk about prognosis, causation, just like any other medical treating physician would testify in any tort claim.

MR. OHLEMEYER: So she is not being offered as an expert to offer opinions about matters beyond her --

MR. RILEY: She will offer some limited opinions.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Is she an expert within the scope of Rule of --

MR. RILEY: Scope of Rule 26(b).

MR. OHLEMEYER: And Rule 701?

MR. RILEY: Yes.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Okay, she is. And I take it, Dr. Turner, and if you need to

I O

avail yourself of the advice of hospital counsel, go right ahead.

MR. CROSS: He is sitting right over here.

MR. OHLEMEYER: I know that. Even though you've been subpoensed, I take it you are not interested or not inclined or not willing to continue with the deposition without regard to what Mr. Wiley's lawyers think?

that all the information that's brought to this table I have seen.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Now, Mr. Cross, when might we continue this deposition?

MR. CROSS: What is your schedule, Dr. Turner?

THE WITNESS: It's horrible. I have to cancel office hours again. Tuesday. Let me know. I will try to cancel office hours again, and I will try and rearrange my schedule.

MR. OHLEMEYER: When might I expect to receive dates for the continuation of the deposition?

MR. CROSS: Undoubtedly in the next few minutes, as soon as we can discuss it.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Is it your intention to produce Dr. Songer for his intention tomorrow?

MR. CROSS: Well, that presumes we have the power to produce Dr. Songer.

Dr. Songer is a witness. He is not a party.

He is not a client.

If he has the same feelings about a significant quantity of documents appearing for the first time after a lapse of several years, I would imagine that he, too, would want to opportunity to review records and make sure that his testimony is based upon all the knowledge that he ought to have in order to give those opinions.

I would imagine he will be of the same opinion. But I, of course, can't speak to him; and I have not talked to him.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Is he not an expert?

MR. CROSS: He is in the same position as --

THE WITNESS: He's an oncologist

MR. RILEY: He's an expert with regard to his treatment. I am not offering him for anything aside from his treatment.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Do you have any objection to us talking to Dr. Songer about his ability to attend the deposition tomorrow?

MR. HOWARD: Have you talked with him about the records that were found?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. HOWARD: Has he had a chance to look at those records?

THE WITNESS: No, he has not seen them.

MR. OHLEMEYER: My question,
Mr. Cross, do you have any objection to me
talking with Dr. Songer, seeing he is a fact
witness, about his ability to proceed with
the deposition tomorrow?

MR. CROSS: Obviously, I don't have any objections to you talking to Dr. Songer at all because he is not within my power to control whether he talks to anyone or not.

Insofar as whether or not you want to talk to him about whether he is able to

continue on with the scheduled deposition 1 tomorrow or not, I think we would all be 2 interested to know that. Again, it's up to 3 I have no objection to you talking to But I don't see that makes any 5 difference. 6

MR. HOWARD: We certainly want to be present.

Let's bring him in. TITTLE: Do you want me to go THE WITNESS: get him?

> Is he here? MR. CROSS:

He is probably seeing THE WITNESS: patients, unless he is down in emergency.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Mr. Cross, let me make sure I have the record straight. We are adjourning the deposition of your expert, Dr. Turner, at your request based part upon the witness's request she be afforded an opportunity to review medical records and hospital records pertaining to Mrs. Wiley.

We are doing so over our objection and without waiver of our intention to consider. whether or if the subsequent scheduling and

http://legacy.library.ucsf.ed//tid/lerr07/a90/pdfw.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/lmil0001

7

В

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 attendance at the deposition is at our 2 expense or your expense. 3 MR. CROSS: With the exception that I think the Court could be available this 5 afternoon to argue that issue right now, if 6 you want. 7 MR. OHLEMEYER: The Court arguing 8 what issue? 9 MR. CROSS: Ruling on your 10 objection. 11 MR. OHLEMEYER: The expense? 12 MR. CROSS: Ruling on your 13 objection. 14 MR. OHLEMEYER: Our objection to 15 what? 16 MR. CROSS: To continuing this 17 deposition. 18 MR. OHLEMEYER: You don't 19 dispute --20 MR. CROSS: Let me finish. 21 objecting to the continuation of this 22 deposition, are you not? 23 MR. OHLEMEYER: I'm objecting to

its suspension. You certainly don't dispute

our right to continue the deposition, do

you?

MR. CROSS: Certainly not. You're objecting to continuing the deposition.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Continuing the deposition. You and I both know that no judge in the world, including Judge Barnett, is going to make us all sit here and ask a doctor questions who doesn't want to answer questions, for whatever reason. And I'm not suggesting that. But all I'm suggesting is that we are not waiving any argument we might eventually present to the Court about whether or if this doctor should have been prepared to do this before we all got here. Nobody disagrees with that.

MR. HOWARD: Except about the cost issue. This will bankrupt our case if we have to pay for all those guys to come back.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Let's go off the record.

(Discussion off the record from 1:50 p.m. to 1:52 p.m.)

MR. OHLEMEYER: The record should reflect that we imposed upon Dr. Songer to step into the room in the presence of

counsel and Dr. Turner. And it is my understanding that Dr. Songer is noticed for and may have been subpoenaed for a deposition tomorrow. That relates to his involvement in the diagnosis, treatment, or care of Mildred Wiley.

Counsel for Mr. Wiley have suggested that Dr. Songer may not be prepared for that deposition and may indeed desire to continue it. And all we would really like to know, Doctor, is whether that's a fair statement of your situation and, if so, when we might expect to schedule your deposition.

DR. SONGER: I'm not as prepared as I would have hoped to be. We had undertaken the first part of the week to get the full records from the hospital stay, which would include progress notes, lab tests, X-ray reports.

I had an overview of those records
that had come to us as it turns out through
a microfilm that had been done on the
original chart which we keep here in our
office. But I was feeling uncomfortable

not having had time to go over these most recent series of tests.

MR. OHLEMEYER: When you say "we," who do you refer to by "we"? You said we had collected or we had reviewed.

DR. SONGER: I'm not sure.

MR. OHLEMEYER: It was your word, Doctor, not mine.

DR. SONGER: In reference to what?

MR. OHLEMEYER: You said we had -do you want to read back the beginning of
the answer? Maybe I misunderstood

MR. YOUNG: Wait a minute.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Excuse me.

MR. YOUNG: You wait a minute. He is not under oath here. And he is not your deponent to testify. He came in here as a courtesy to talk to us about whether he is ready to give a deposition tomorrow. And the question is whether he feels prepared.

The point I was trying to make before we went on the record was that this office shares a file. And portions of that file were found mysteriously in Dr. Turner's

something.

file cabinet this morning that were not in there last night as of at least midnight or 12:30.

Dr. Turner has testified that

Dr. Songer hadn't had a chance to look at

the documents either. The question is

whether he feels comfortable, if he is able

to give his deposition in light of all

those facts tomorrow. If he is, fine. If

he is not, that's what we brought him in

here to ask him.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Doctor, you don't have to listen to all this. We have a lot of people here from all over the country. Your deposition was scheduled at a time that was represented to us as convenient to you. It's not scheduled until tomorrow afternoon. My question I guess, and our question or interest is, do you think you will have a chance between now and tomorrow afternoon to look at this material so that we can accomplish this deposition and not have to continue it, not have to bring everybody back from all over the country to take it?

DR. SONGER: I had planned to be

prepared today with my review because I'm on call today through tonight and through tomorrow. I'm not sure that I'm going to have time to go over that entire chart to feel like I will have done the review that I would prefer to do.

MR. OHLEMEYER: As you might understand and know, there are certain deadlines that have been imposed upon us by the Court in terms of preparing this case. When might you be available that we can schedule your deposition?

DR. SONGER: If we are able to get all this information together, I would say a week or two weeks would be a reasonable time for me to go over it.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Let's say, for example, if we had a chart today and we put it in front of you, what more would you need to do to refresh your recollection or review portions of the chart that pertain to your treatment or diagnoses?

DR. SONGER: That would be basically what I would plan to do, go into the hospital record.

MR. OHLEMEYER: If the deposition were limited to the facts associated with your diagnosis and treatment of Mrs. Wiley, your observations of her, do you think that's something that we could accomplish tomorrow if we had a well organized set of medical records and could direct your attention to those records that pertain to your treatment and your diagnosis?

MR. CROSS: I think he already said that he's not got an opportunity today, tonight, or tomorrow to review these records because he is on call. He should have had an opportunity to do that in the weeks prior before these documents mysteriously reappeared.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Just so the record is clear, Doctor, do you have any idea of what we keep talking about these mysteriously reappearing documents? What is it you understand to have been the mysteriously reappeared documents?

DR. SONGER: At some time in the past, it was discovered that the record that we keep in common here at Medical

Consultants on this patient was not anywhere to be found.

At that point, we became concerned about security. We took precautions about securing the rest of the information relative to her records, including pathology slides, X-rays, and other things that we need, that are needed in order to review this case.

I was working under the presumption that we were not going to have access to that at the deposition. That just was not going to be available.

Sometime I believe since the first of the week, talking to Dr. Turner, she informed me that one of our people, Sylvia in medical records, had checked for whatever reason in the microfilm area and had found what was presumably the entire chart that we keep here.

Unfortunately, that was limited to summaries, did not have -- did not have laboratory tests, X-ray reports, did not have what we call the progress record where I would have handwritten, for example, my

interpretation of what was going on and what I might have ordered or recommended.

As of earlier in the week, I had asked her to see if that was available, if that information was available from the hospital. The next thing I find out today is that there was a set of records referable to that hospitalization in Dr. Turner's office and that also the medical records department has found, I guess, the original chart and has either prepared or sent a copy of the hospitalization.

This is the first I knew of their availability. I was certainly hoping that they would be available so that I could come nearer recollecting and putting into perspective what my recollection of the case was.

MR. OHLEMEYER: I take it you are telling me without the records, you don't have an independent recollection or complete recollection of your treatment of the patient? Am I right?

DR. SONGER: That's correct. I do

not remember this patient relative to what she looked like, where she was in the hospital, and how long she was in the hospital. I just do not remember.

MR. OHLEMEYER: And I take it
you're telling us that you don't believe -well, I don't want to put words in your
mouth. Anywhere from "I'll try, but I can't
say until tomorrow I can be ready" until
"I'm not going to show up tomorrow," there's
a position on that spectrum where you are at
this point in time. Can you tell us where
you think you are?

DR. SONGER: I would be better prepared with a continuance where I could have time to sit down. I don't know at this point what I'm going to find in those records that I need to reflect on. I'm basically at this point limited to my consultation, discharge summary, and autopsy report. And that would be about the extent of what I have had a chance to review.

I think when I am able to review the chart relative to what I wrote in the chart and I think --

MR. BYRON: But, Doctor, couldn't you finish all that before 2:00 tomorrow afternoon?

DR. SONGER: I don't know. I'm on call. I'm waiting now to see patients.

MR. OHLEMEYER: To be fair to the doctor --

DR. SONGER: I felt I was prepared relative to the information I had. But now there's going to be more information between now and tomorrow. This case is how old? I think it's less than ideal for me to be under a 24-hour gun to review what might be far more information than I have had a chance to review.

MR. OHLEMEYER: But I guess,

Doctor, the advantage we have you don't have
is we know what the chart looks like and
what your notes look like. We have had them
all. We have obviously spent more time
looking at it than you have probably.

I think we could all fairly agree they don't seem to be lengthy or extensive. It may be you just don't remember that.

MR. CROSS: For the record, the

I

plaintiffs aren't sure of that at all. We are not sure. We have seen documents this morning that none of us have seen before.

MR. OHLEMEYER: But not from Dr. Songer.

MR. CROSS: We don't know that.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Well, I'm telling you that. And I guess you're not going to agree with me. I guess we will have to talk amongst ourselves and decide what happens tomorrow.

What we are trying to avoid, Doctor, is a situation where we have to subpoena you for a deposition on a short period of time, at a time that's inconvenient for you that is necessary to comply with some Court orders.

So tomorrow is a date that we all, you know, thought we could get this done and get it done. And we still think we could get it done and get it done. But if not, we're trying to avoid a situation where in the next week or 10 days, we just show up and say here's where you have to be and when you have to be there.

DR. SONGER: As I say, I don't anticipate I'm going to need a long time to review. But I do want some time to be sure I'm not staying up all night tonight trying to put together this review and come tomorrow not having gone to bed tonight.

MR. CROSS: Counsel, I think you have your record. I think the issues you want to preserve are preserved. I think the doctor has clearly indicated that he is of the opinion that he would be at a severe disadvantage to continue with the deposition.

So I think we should go ahead and plan the deposition. You can argue to the Court your concerns about the cost of coming back here and those things. But I think we ought to let this man get back to his patients.

MR. OHLEMEYER: I don't disagree with that.

MR. BYRON: Before we leave, can we get a date set?

MR. CROSS: We can do that off the record, Dan.

MR. BYRON: It has to agree with his calendar though.

MR. HOWARD: Didn't you say a week, Doctor?

DR. SONGER: I can't imagine a week or 10 days, whatever. I'm not going to be out of town. As long as I have some time in advance to move patients.

MR. BYRON: You think by next
Wednesday, you'd be in a position where you
could have reviewed the documents and be
ready for a deposition?

DR. SONGER: If I'm going to have all of the things available to me that would consist of the entire chart.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Doctor, the problem we're having is nobody in this room seems to agree as to where or who should do that for you. Are you suggesting that we should prepare a chart for you or that the hospital is going to do that for you or that somebody has done it?

DR. SONGER: As of today, I have reason to believe that we have access to this chart.

THE WITNESS: This is the chart.

MR. HOWARD: That's the medical records.

MR. WAGNER: That's the statement I was going to make. I mean, I haven't reviewed those documents, Dr. Turner. But isn't that the chart? Isn't that the Ball Memorial records?

THE WITNESS: We hope this is all of it. See, the problem is there are duplications, which is why I had to stop before. It was very out of order. And I believe this is all of it now.

MR. WAGNER: That's what I thought.

THE WITNESS: This was all mixed

up.

MR. WAGNER: I mean, the medical records pertaining to the treatment of Mildred Wiley at Ball Memorial Hospital, which reflect the treatment given by Drs. Turner and Songer are right here in this room. And they certainly didn't mysteriously appear. I mean, they were here.

The only document that anybody has

expressed any surprise about seeing is Exhibit 3.

MR. YOUNG: That's not accurate.

That stack of material contains the items
that were found mysteriously this morning at
8:00. And they are interspersed within that
document.

MR. WAGNER: The stack of records you are talking about are the medical chart pertaining to Ball Memorial?

MR. YOUNG: What he is rubber banding right now.

would object to -- I don't think we need any more of Dr. Songer's time. Wait a minute.

I'm sorry. I'm talking to Mr. Howard.

Mr. Wagner has some suggestion that this has some question for the doctor about whether there is something he could review between now and 2:00 tomorrow. I don't want to put words in anybody's mouth.

MR. CROSS: He has already said twice he doesn't have the time between now and 2:00 tomorrow; isn't that right?

DR. SONGER: I can't promise you

that I'll be able to do that between now and tomorrow.

MR. BYRON: Don't you think that would take something like an hour to go through there and find what you might be connected with?

MR. CROSS: I don't know how many times he has to say it.

DR. SONGER: I will know a lot about that chart that will be more than I will be able to learn in one hour.

MR. BYRON: How many hours do you think it will take for your review?

DR. SONGER: Again, not knowing what I'm going to find, but I will go through that entire chart; and I would guess I will spend probably 10, 12 hours going over that chart, if I have the time.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Let's mark this as the next exhibit. For the record, what you have referred to as "that chart" is what I'm going to mark as Exhibit 13. This is what you are referring to as requiring 10 hours of your time?

(Exhibit(s) 13 marked for

identification).

MR. CROSS: Here again, this is not his deposition.

MR. OHLEMEYER: That's my question, just so there is no misunderstanding about this.

THE WITNESS: Why don't you let him see the chart and that would help him.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: You're asking him a question, and he doesn't know what's in there.

MR. RILEY: If you are going to ask him questions, I think you need to put him under oath.

MR. OHLEMEYER: He doesn't need to be under oath. This is not a deposition of him.

MR. RILEY: So this is not a deposition useable in court, except for some hearing on something or another?

MR. OHLEMEYER: Correct. I'm not interrogating the doctor. We're all trying to help each other out here.

MR. BYRON: We are trying to figure

out whether we can do this tomorrow or

whether we need to go to some other day.

MR. HOWARD: He said three times

that he can't be prepared to read all the charts. Now, maybe some of you guys back when you were doctors could have done it quicker than that. But this doctor has said he can't be ready tomorrow.

MR. BYRON: He is now taking a good faith look at it.

MR. HOWARD: Oh, he wasn't telling you in good faith before?

MR. BYRON: He hadn't looked at the chart. Now, he is looking at the chart.

MR. WAGNER: Do you want to sit down, Doctor? You are certainly welcome to use that chair.

THE WITNESS: Joe, I don't know if this goes in there or not. I mean, everything is all mixed up. And this is stuff from outpatient. You might want to look at that as well. Everything is all mixed up.

MR. OHLEMEYER: The second stack that Dr. Turner has handed Dr. Songer, we

ought to mark as Exhibit 14.

MR. YOUNG: Where are these things coming from?

MR. OHLEMEYER: From Dr. Turner.

(Exhibit(s) 14 marked for identification).

MR. OHLEMEYER: The third stack

Dr. Turner has in front of her I would like

to mark as Exhibit 15.

(Exhibit(s) 15 marked for identification).

DR. SONGER: I would stand on the request for a continuance.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Doctor, who should we talk with about finding a convenient time for the deposition?

Sorry, Dr. Turner. I mean Dr. Songer. Should we deal with your office directly?

DR. SONGER: Was it Sylvia?

THE WITNESS: Yes, Sylvia.

DR. SONGER: That would be the person to talk to. I can say as long as. I have got -- I'm not going out of town. I can pretty much move patients around if I have a few days' notice. I think a week, in

that range, whatever works out to everybody's advantage so I can comply.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Thank you, Doctor.

MR. BYRON: Doctor, you're saying you think 10 to 12 hours of time you will need for the review?

DR. SONGER: Yes. What this does, it gives you time sequences which summaries don't give you. And that's what I need.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Thank you, Doctor.

BY MR. OHLEMEYER:

- Q Before we conclude this, let me make the record. We have marked as Exhibit 14 a stack of records that Dr. Turner collated for us, right?
- A Yes.
 - Q Tell us what you believe these records to be?
 - A These are similar to these, but they have progress notes in them.
 - Q These being Exhibit 13, right?
 - A Exhibit 14 has progress notes. See, the problem is that when you handed all these, they were all mixed up.
 - Q Doctor, just so the record is clear, you're

not accusing me of mixing them up?

- A I am just saying when they are handed to me, they were mixed up. The charts were mixed up.
- Q And if I suggested to you -
 MR. CROSS: Let her finish her

 answer.
- Q If I suggested to you when they were handed to me they were in that state, you wouldn't disagree with me, would you?
- A What I handed to you was a group of charts or group of papers that had a rubber band around them that I found in my file. And then I handed you the chart from the hospital. But the rubber band was taken off, and so everything was mixed up. That's one of the reasons why I had to delay this.
- Q Tell us what Exhibit 13 is.
- A Thirteen is, wherever this came from, is a chart but without progress notes.
- Q A chart of what?
- A A chart from the hospital.
- Q Pertaining to Mr. Wiley?
 - A To Mrs. Wiley. But this does not have progress notes, so these are probably the

progress notes that go through here.

- Q These being Exhibit 14?
- A Yes.

- Q Tell us what Exhibit 15 is.
- A Exhibit 15 looks like they are copies of microfilm. Where these came from, whether these came from the hospital or from the office -- I doubt if they would be coming from our office. But I can't be certain.
- Q Now, there's another stack that you handed me to hand to Dr. Songer that we will mark as Exhibit 16. Tell us what that is.
- A Those are additional -- one is a pathologist's report. One is copies, someone has made an extra copy of a bronchoscopy note. One looks like an outpatient procedure by Dr. Dove on Mildred Wiley dated the 14th of May.

And I don't know whether you handed them to me or they are from the hospital chart. These again are from Dr. Kocoshis and Dr. Dickerson, again having to do with radiation.

Q And there are some consent forms and authorizations in here, right?

		1
		2
		3
	•	4
		5
	•	5
	•	5 7
	ξ	3
	9	•
1	. ()
1	. 1	L
1	. 2	2
1	. 3	
1	4	
ŀ	. 2 . 3 . 4 . 5 . 6 . 7	
1	6	
1	7	
1	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	
2	4	

- Q Those are standard Ball Memorial Hospital forms?
- A Yes.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Let's mark those then as Exhibit 17.

(Exhibit(s) 16 marked for identification).

Q Let me ask you this, Doctor: With respect to the autopsy report that is attached to this group of exhibits we have labeled Exhibit 16, there's a checkmark in the top right-hand corner. There a a Roman numeral I next to the hospital number. And then there's some handwriting here that looks to me like an arrow.

MR. CROSS: Just a minute. I thought we were going to continue this deposition. Now, we're going --

MR. OHLEMEYER: Mr. Cross, we are making a record. Don't you want an accurate record?

MR. CROSS: I don't want you to ask this questions about a document until she has had an opportunity to review it and

she's comfortable with it. I think she's already indicated on the record she would like an opportunity to look at all these records.

MR. OHLEMEYER: The record is going to reflect that the witness and I are looking at the same document and that I haven't finished my question yet. Once I finish my question, you can make whatever objection you would like.

- Q But my question, Doctor, is: The autopsy report that is part of Exhibit 16 has a checkmark in the top right-hand corner, right.
- A Yes.

- Q Is that your checkmark?
- A I cannot tell us.
- Q Are you right handed or left handed?
- 19 A Right.
 - Q It has a Roman numeral I there, right?
- 21 A Yes.
 - Q And it has what appears to be an arrow with the letters CA15-3 underlined?
- 24 A Yes.
- Q Is that your handwriting?

A That's my handwriting.

MR. CROSS: Your question is concluded. She has given you an answer. That suspiciously sounds like a question about a document and its contents. I think we have already established we're going to continue this deposition until another date.

Now, quit asking the witness
questions. You're not making a record
pertaining to the continuance or anything
else. You're asking her substantive
questions about the medical records, which
I don't know. Have we seen these records?
I don't know that I have.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Counsel, you know, five years into a case, every now and then it might help to take a look at some of the medical records.

MR. CROSS: You're right about that. We're thinking the same thing this morning.

MR. OHLEMEYER: What are we going to do with the exhibits, counsel? Who is going to keep them? Who is going to make copies of them? How are they going to be

distributed? How are we going assure ourselves that nothing mysteriously disappears from these exhibits?

MR. CROSS: Obviously, I think it would be appropriate at this point in time for a representative of both sides to take over and make sure that an adequate number of copies are made.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Why don't we give them to the court reporter and let the court reporter make copies for everybody?

MR. FURR: We need to mark the documents that are being copied.

MR. OHLEMEYER: For the record, we have an Exhibit 1, which is the Notice to take deposition.

For the record, we have Exhibit 2, which is a 5-29-91 admission note.

We have an Exhibit 3 which is progress notes dated May 24 and May 25, 1993.

We have an Exhibit 4, which is the curriculum vitae of Nicki Carol Turner.

We have Exhibit 5, which is a May 13, 1993, letter from Dr. Thomas Kocoshis to Dr. Turner.

. 23

We have an Exhibit 6, which is a memo to all physicians from Stacey Burt dated October 14th, 1996, with handwriting on the back. So that should be a two-sided exhibit certainly.

We have an Exhibit 7, which is Tobacco on Trial, Number Four, 1995.

THE WITNESS: What does that have to do with the case?

MR. BYRON: We are just identifying the documents.

THE WITNESS: I know, but why is it an exhibit?

MR. OHLEMEYER: Doctor, I would be happy to withdraw it as an exhibit if you would be willing to describe it for us and tell us what it is. But Mr. Cross doesn't appear to think you or I should be asking or answering those types of questions.

THE WITNESS: It doesn't matter to me. It has to do with -- it doesn't matter if I answer it.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Exhibit 7 is "Tobacco on Trial," November 4, 1995.

Exhibit 8 is "Passive Smoking" by

Stephen Jay, October 24, 1995.

Exhibit 9 and Exhibit 10 are the Ball Memorial Hospital records previously identified as same day surgery sheets; is that right? How would you describe those, same day surgery sheets?

THE WITNESS: Yes, ER or same day surgery.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Exhibit 11 is the package of materials of medical records provided to you by plaintiffs' counsel; is that right?

> THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. OHLEMEYER: And I will ask the court reporter to make a copy of the outside envelope with the exhibit sticker and attach the contents as the remainder of the exhibit.

MR. HOWARD: May I make a Those are the only records suggestion here? in existence. I don't think if we are going to have these doctors reviewing those, why don't we see if the hospital can't make us -- those are hospital records. I don't imagine they will want those to go out of

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

here today. If we could get an entire set of those run by the hospital, do you think that would be possible, Dr. Turner?

MR. OHLEMEYER: I understand it,
Mr. Howard, they are not hospital records.
That's part of the issue here. They are
office records.

And I'm certainly happy to let anyone make copies of these records that they would like to make copies of these records.

But I would prefer that whatever we do, we keep these exhibits in the current form they are in and have somebody make copies of them as soon as possible.

And it seems to me the most

appropriate and easiest way to do it is to

have the court reporter do it. And he can

tell us how quickly he can do it. And he

can make any necessary arrangements with

the doctors' office to assure the

safekeeping of those records as I am sure

they do in many other cases.

Exhibit 12 is the death summary dictated July 21, 1991 by Dr. Turner.

MR. CROSS: She has identified the

IO

rest of them.

MR. OHLEMEYER: She has identified 13, 14, 15, and 16.

For the record, we also have a group of exhibits that we have sent out to make copies of.

We ought to identify that as

Exhibit 17 and distribute copies of that to

everybody as soon as possible. One way to

do it is to mark a copy as Exhibit 17, have

the court reporter take it, and have him

make copies for whoever wants copies.

Another way to do it would be to painstakingly make a record of every piece of literature that is part of that exhibit.

Another way to do it would be to have Mr. Shockley distribute copies as he has already made to everybody. I leave it to you to tell me how you want to do it with Exhibit 17.

MR. FURR: Do you need to mark those?

MR. OHLEMEYER: I will get to those in a second. What do you want to do about Exhibit 17?

MR. WAGNER: For the record, 2 Exhibit 17 is what we are referring to. The documents being copied consist largely of. articles, medical articles, and journal articles that largely deal with smoking and smoking-related issues; isn't that right, Doctor?

> THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. CROSS: I think the record can show that Mr. Shockley took the "original stack" of those documents out of here this morning while the deposition was in progress and took them to a local copy place and established or asked them to make a number of copies.

I'm certain they will designate what those originals were. I would simply suggest that we ask the court reporter to go by there on his way out of town and mark the original set of documents as 17 and distribute the copies to the rest of us.

MR. BYRON: Mr. Shockley took those documents pursuant to the agreement of all counsel.

> MR. OHLEMEYER: From that stack, so

25

24

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

the record is clear, there were a few items that were not taken to Kinko's. Dr. Turner has produced a number of slides and photographs that she has referred to as the Calvin and Barney stuff or materials; is that correct.

THE WITNESS: It's an educational program for children.

MR. OHLEMEYER: I understand that. I don't mean to disparage it or diminish it, but that's what that is, right?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. OHLEMEYER: And we did not take this out to make copies. At this point, I don't want to make copies of it. But if at a subsequent deposition, we asked to you produce the Calvin and Barney envelope, could you do that for us?

> THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Also the record will reflect we did not send out the "Health Consequences of Smoking, " 1984; and "Health Consequences of Involuntarily Smoking," Surgeon General's reports. We did not send out the Cigarette Papers by Glantz.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We did not send out a newspaper article from the USA Today that was produced by the doctor dated October 18, 1996, the "Life" section of that paper.

We did not send out a note that appears to be in the doctor's handwriting?

- A It was one of the secretary's.
- Q That says: Teresa call Sylvia, 2173,
 Dr. Turner and Dr. Songer, Mildred Wiley,
 need by Wednesday at 9:00, asked for above
 10/20 in black ink.

And then in blue ink, there is the number 212912, 24 lawyers, and then the dates 5/91 - 6/24/91. Is that your writing, Doctor, the blue ink?

THE WITNESS: No.

MR. OHLEMEYER: The record will reflect the back of this note says 3501, tell Diana I've got it and thanks. Again not your handwriting?

THE WITNESS: I don't know who wrote that. I don't know if it has to do with this case.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Finally the other thing we did not send out for copying this

morning was an article entitled, "Indoor Radon and Lung Cancer, Estimating the Risks, by Jonathan M. Samet M.D. The cite, Doctor?

THE WITNESS: Biomedical Science.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Do you know what issue this was? Does it say?

THE WITNESS: Western Journal of Medicine, 1992, Volume 156.

MR. OHLEMEYER: And with that then, as I understand it and without repeating the record we have made previously, we are suspending the deposition. Go in peace.

MR. FURR: One further comment. There is no agreement there is a limitation of four additional hours.

MR. OHLEMEYER: Correct. has agreed to that. Thank you, Doctor.

NICKI C. TURNER, M.D.

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

STATE OF INDIANA)
COUNTY OF MARION)

I, Thomas A. Richardson, a Notary Public in and for said county and state, do hereby certify that the deponent herein was by me first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the aforementioned matter;

That the foregoing deposition was taken on behalf of the defendants; that said deposition was taken at the time and place heretofore mentioned between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m.;

That said deposition was taken down in stenograph notes and afterwards reduced to typewriting under my direction; and that the typewritten transcript is a true record of the testimony given by said deponent;

And thereafter presented to said witness for signature; that this certificate does not purport to acknowledge or verify the signature hereto of the deponent.

I do further certify that I am a disinterested person in this cause of action; that I am not a relative of the attorneys for any of the parties.